



E  
178  
A56  
v.1

CORNELL  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY



CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 088 421 460



Cornell University  
Library

The original of this book is in  
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in  
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924088421460>

# HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

BY

E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS  
PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY

WITH MAPS

VOLUME I.

NEW YORK  
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1894



COPYRIGHT, 1894, BY  
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

339869B  
X

STROUD DIRECTORY  
PRINTING AND BOOK-BINDING COMPANY  
NEW YORK

cm

TO MY WIFE





## PREFACE

NOTWITHSTANDING the number of United States histories already in existence, and the excellence of many of them, I venture to think that no apology is needed for bringing forward another.

1. The volume now presented to the public is believed to utilize, more than any of its predecessors, the many valuable researches of recent years into the rich archives of this and other nations.

2. Most of the briefer treatments of the subject are manuals, intended for pupils in schools, the conspicuous articulation so necessary for this purpose greatly lessening their interest for the general reader. The following narrative will be found continuous as well as of moderate compass.

3. I have sought to make more prominent than popular histories have usually done, at the same time the political evolution of our country on the one hand, and the social culture, habits, and life of the people on the other.

4. The work strives to observe scrupulous proportion in treating the different parts and phases

of our national career, neglecting none and over-emphasizing none. Also, while pronouncedly national and patriotic, it is careful to be perfectly fair and kind to the people of all sections.

5. Effort has been made to present the matter in the most natural periods and divisions, and to give such a title to each of these as to render the table of contents a truthful and instructive epitome of our national past.

6. With the same aim the Fore-history is exhibited in sharp separation from the United States history proper, calling due attention to what is too commonly missed, the truly epochal character of the adoption of our present Constitution, in 1789.

7. No pains has been spared to secure perfect accuracy in all references to dates, persons, and places, so that the volume may be used with confidence as a work of reference. I am persuaded that much success in this has been attained, despite the uncertainty still attaching to many matters of this sort in United States history, especially to dates.

BROWN UNIVERSITY, September 15, 1894.

# CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

PAGE

AMERICA BEFORE COLUMBUS . . . . . xxi

Age and Origin of Man in America.—Primordial Americans unlike Present Asiatics.—Resemblances between their Various Branches.—Two Great Types.—The Mound-builders' Age.—Design of the Mounds.—Different Forms.—Towns and Cities.—Proofs of Culture.—Arts.—Fate of the Mound-builders.—The Indians.—Their Number.—Degree of Civilization.—Power of Endurance.—Religion.—The Various Nations.—Original Brute Inhabitants of North America.—Plants, Fruits, and Trees.—Indian Agriculture.

## Part First

### THE FORE-HISTORY

#### PERIOD I

#### *DISCOVERY AND SETTLEMENT*

1492-1660

CHAPTER I. COLUMBUS . . . . . 1

Bretons and Normans in the New World.—The Northmen Question.—Marco Polo's Travels.—His Pictures of Eastern Asia.—Influence on Columbus.—Early Life of Columbus.—His Cruises and Studies.—Asia to be Reached by Sailing West.—

Appeals for Aid.—Rebuffs.—Success.—Sails from Palos.—The Voyage.—America Discovered.—Columbus's Later Voyages and Discoveries.—Illusion Respecting the New Land.—Amerigo Vespucci.—Rise of the Name "America."

PAGE

CHAPTER II. EARLY SPANISH AMERICA. . . 12

Portugal and Spain Divide the Newly Discovered World.—Spain gets most of America.—Voyage of de Solis.—Balboa Discovers the Pacific.—Ponce de Leon on the Florida Coast.—Explorations by Grijalva.—Cortez Invades Mexico.—Subjugates the Country.—De Ayllon's Cruise.—Magellan Circumnavigates the Globe.—Narvaez's Expedition into Florida.—Its Sad Fate.—De Soto.—His March.—Hardships.—Discovers the Mississippi.—His Death.—End of His Expedition.—French Settlement in Florida.—St. Augustine.—French-Spanish Hostilities.—Reasons for Spain's Failure to Colonize far North.—Her Treatment of the Natives.—Tyranny over her own Colonies.

CHAPTER III. EXPLORATION AND COLONIZATION BY THE FRENCH AND THE ENGLISH 23

Verrazano.—"New France."—Cartier Discovers St. Lawrence Gulf and River.—Second Voyage.—Montreal.—Third.—De Monts.—Champlain.—Founds Quebec.—Westward Explorations.—John Cabot, Discoverer of the North American Main.—Frobisher.—Tries for a Northwest Passage.—Second Expedition for Gold.—Third.—Eskimo Tradition of Frobisher's Visits.—Drake Sails Round the World.—Cavendish Follows.—Raleigh's Scheme.—Colony at Roanoke Island.—"Virginia."—Second Colony.—Its Fate.

CHAPTER IV. THE PLANTING OF VIRGINIA . 31

The Old Virginia Charter.—Jamestown Settled.—Company and Colony.—Character of Early Virginia Population.—Progress.—Products.—Slavery.—Agriculture the Dominant Industry.—No Town Life.—Hardships and Dissensions.—John Smith.—New Charter.—Delaware Governor.—The "Starving

Time."—Severe Rule of Dale and Argall.—The Change of 1612.—Pocahontas.—Indian Hostilities.—First American Legislature.—Sir Thomas Wyatt.—Self-government.—Virginia Reflects English Political Progress.—Dissolution of the Company.—Charles I. and Virginia.—Harvey, Wyatt, Berkeley.—Virginia under Cromwell.

PAGE

CHAPTER V. PILGRIM AND PURITAN AT THE  
NORTH . . . . . 39

The first "Independents."—John Smyth's Church at Gainsborough.—The Scrooby Church.—Plymouth Colony.—Settles Plymouth.—Hardships.—Growth.—Cape Ann Settlement.—Massachusetts Bay.—Size.—Polity.—Roger Williams.—His Views.—His Exile.—Anne Hutchinson.—Rhode Island Founded.—Settlement of Hartford, Windsor, Wethersfield.—Saybrook.—New Haven.—New Hampshire.—Maine.—New England Confederation.—Its Function.—Its Failure.

CHAPTER VI. BALTIMORE AND HIS MARYLAND 48

Sir George Calvert Plants at Newfoundland.—Is Ennobled.—Sails for Virginia.—Grant of Maryland.—Lord Baltimore Dies.—Succeeded by Cecil.—Government of Maryland.—Conflict with Virginia.—Baltimore Comes to Maryland.—Religious Freedom in the Colony.—Clayborne's Rebellion.—First Maryland Assembly.—Anarchy.—Romanism Established.—Baltimore and Roger Williams.—Maryland during the Civil War in England.—Death of Baltimore.—Character.—Maryland under the Long Parliament.—Puritan Immigration.—Founds Annapolis.—Rebellion.—Clayborne Again.—Maryland and the Commonwealth.—Deposition of Governor Stone.—Anti-Catholic Laws.—Baltimore Defied.—Sustained by Cromwell.—Fendall's Rebellion.—Fails.—Maryland at the Restoration.

CHAPTER VII. NEW NETHERLAND . . . . . 56

Henry Hudson and his Explorations.—Enters Hudson River.—His Subsequent Career.—And His Fate.—Dutch Trade on the

Hudson.—“New Netherland.”—Dutch West India Company.—Albany Begun.—New Amsterdam.—Relations with Plymouth.—De Vries on the Delaware.—Dutch Fort at Hartford.—Conflict of Dutch with English.—Gustavus Adolphus.—Swedish Beginnings at Wilmington, Delaware.—Advent of Kieft.—Mal-treats Indians.—New Netherland in 1647.—Stuyvesant’s Excellent Rule.—Conquers New Sweden.—And the Indians.—Con-quest of Dutch America by England.—“New York.”—Persist-ence of Dutch Influence and Traits.

PAGE

## CHAPTER VIII. THE FIRST INDIAN WARS . 62

Beginning of Indian Hostility.—Of Pequot War.—Mason’s Strategy.—And Tactics.—Capture of Pequot Fort.—Back to Say-brook.—Extermination of Pequot Tribe.—Peace.—Miantino-moh and Uncas.—Dutch War with Indians.—Caused by Kieft’s Impolicy. — Liquor. — Underhill Comes. — Mrs. Hutchinson’s Fate.—Deborah Moody.—New Haven Refuses Aid.—Appeal to Holland.—Underhill’s Exploits.—Kieft Removed.—Sad Plight of New Netherland.—Subsequent Hostilities and Final Peace.

## PERIOD II

*ENGLISH AMERICA TILL THE END OF  
THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR*

1660-1763

CHAPTER I. NEW ENGLAND UNDER THE LAST  
STUARTS . . . . . 71

Charles II. and Massachusetts.—Massachusetts about 1660.—Its View of its Political Rights.—The King’s View.—And Com-mands.—Commission of 1664.—Why Vengeance was Delayed.—Boldness of the Colony.—It Buys Maine.—Fails to Get New Hampshire.—The King’s Rage.—The Charter Vacated.—Charles II. and Connecticut.—Prosperity of this Colony.—Rhode Island.—Boundary Disputes of Connecticut.—Of Rhode Island.—

George Fox and Roger Williams.—James II. King.—Andros Governor.—Andros and Southern New England.—In Massachusetts.—Revolution of 1688.—New Charter for Massachusetts.—Defects and Merits.

CHAPTER II. KING PHILIP'S WAR . . . 82

Whites' Treatment of Red Men.—Indian Hatred.—Causes.—Alexander's Death.—Philip King.—Scope of his Conspiracy.—Murders Sansaman.—War Began.—Nipmucks take Part.—War in Connecticut Valley.—Bloody Brook.—The Swamp Fight at South Kingston, R. I.—Central Massachusetts Aflame.—The Rowlandson History.—S. E. Massachusetts and Rhode Island Again.—Connecticut Valley once more Invaded.—Turner's Falls.—Philip's Death.—Horrors of the War.—Philip's Character.—Fate of his Family.

CHAPTER III. THE SALEM WITCHCRAFT. . . 92

New England Home Life.—Religion its Centre.—The Farmhouse.—Morning Devotions.—Farm Work.—Tools.—Diet.—Neighborliness.—New England Superstitions.—Not Peculiar to New England.—Sunday Laws.—Public Worship.—First Case of Sorcery.—The Witch Executed.—Cotton Mather.—His Experiments.—His Book.—The Parris Children Bewitched.—The Manifestations.—The Trial.—Executions.—George Burroughs.—Rebecca Nurse.—Reaction.—Forwardness of Clergy.—"Devil's Authority."—The End.

CHAPTER IV. THE MIDDLE COLONIES . . . 103

English Conquest of New Netherland.—Duke of York's Government.—Andros.—Revolution of 1688.—Leisler.—Problems which Teased Royal Governors.—New Jersey.—Its Political Vicissitudes.—William Penn.—Character.—Liberality of Pennsylvania Charter.—Penn and James II.—Penn's Services for his Colony.—Prosperity of the Latter.—Fletcher's Rule.—Gabriel Thomas's History of Pennsylvania.—Penn's Trials—And Victory.—Delaware.

	PAGE
CHAPTER V. MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, CAROLINA .. . . .	110

Maryland after the Stuart Restoration.—Navigation Act.—Boundary Disputes.—Liberality of Religion.—Agitation to Establish Anglicanism.—Maryland under William and Mary.—English Church Established.—Not Oppressive.—Fate of Virginia after the Restoration.—Virginia's Spirit, Numbers, Resources.—Causes of Bacon's Rebellion.—Evil of the Navigation Acts.—Worthless Officials.—Course of the Rebellion.—Result.—Dulness of the Subsequent History.—William and Mary College.—Governor Spotswood.—Blackbeard.—Carolina.—Its Constitution.—Conflict of Parties.—Georgia.

CHAPTER VI. GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE COLONIES . . . . .	119
--	-----

Origin of American Political Institutions.—Local Self-government.—Representation.—Relation of Colonies to England.—Classification of Colonies.—Changes.—Conflict of Legal Views.—Colonists' Contentions.—Taxation.

CHAPTER VII. SOCIAL CULTURE IN COLONIAL TIMES . . . . .	123
---	-----

Population of the Colonies at Different Dates.—Differences according to Sections.—Intellectual Ability.—Free Thought.—Political Bent.—English Church in the Colonies.—Its Clergy.—In New York.—The New England Establishment.—Hatred to Episcopacy.—Counter-hatred.—Colleges and Schools.—Newspapers.—Libraries.—Postal System.—Learned Professions.—Epidemics.—Scholars and Artists.—Travelling.—Manufactures and Commerce.—Houses.—Food and Dress.—Wigs.—Opposition to Them.—Social Cleavage.—Redemptioners.—Penal Legislation.—Philadelphia Leads in Social Science.

CHAPTER VIII. ENGLAND AND FRANCE IN AMERICA . . . . .	136
--	-----

The French in the Heart of the Continent.—Groseilliers, Radisson, La Salle.—Joliet and Marquette Reach the Mississippi.—



Baudin and Du Lhut.—La Salle Descends to the Gulf.—“Chicago.”—The Portages.—La Salle’s Expedition from France to the Mississippi.—Its Fate.—French, Indians, and English.—France’s Advantage.—Numbers of each Race in America.—Causes of England’s Colonial Strength.—King William’s War.—The Schenectady Massacre.—Other Atrocities.—Anne’s War.—Deerfield.—Plans for Striking Back.—Second Capture of Port Royal.—Rasle’s Settlement Raided.—George’s War.—Capture of Louisburg.—Saratoga Destroyed.—Scheme to Retaliate.—Failure.—French Vigilance and Aggression.

CHAPTER IX. THE FRENCH AND INDIAN PAGE  
WAR . . . . . 146

Struggle Inevitable.—George Washington.—Fights at Great Meadows.—War Begun.—English Plans of Campaign.—Braddock’s March.—Defeat and Death.—Prophecy Regarding Washington.—The “Evangeline” History.—London’s Incompetence.—Pitt at the Head of Affairs.—Will Take Canada.—Louisburg Recaptured.—“Pittsburgh.”—Triple Movement upon Canada.—The Plains of Abraham.—Quebec Capitulates.—Peace of Paris.—Conspiracy of Pontiac.

### PERIOD III

## REVOLUTION AND THE OLD CONFEDERATION

1763-1789

CHAPTER I. RESULTS OF THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR . . . . . 154

How Important.—Vergennes’s Prophecy.—England in Debt.—Tempted to Tax Colonies.—Colonies Strengthened.—Military Experience Gained.—Leaders Trained.—Fighting Power Revealed.—Best of All, Union.—How Developed.—Nothing but War could have done This.—Scattered Condition of Population Then.—Difficulties of Communication.—Other Centrifugal

	PAGE
CHAPTER V. MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, CAROLINA .. . . .	110

Maryland after the Stuart Restoration.—Navigation Act.—Boundary Disputes.—Liberality of Religion.—Agitation to Establish Anglicanism.—Maryland under William and Mary.—English Church Established.—Not Oppressive.—Fate of Virginia after the Restoration.—Virginia's Spirit, Numbers, Resources.—Causes of Bacon's Rebellion.—Evil of the Navigation Acts.—Worthless Officials.—Course of the Rebellion.—Result.—Dulness of the Subsequent History.—William and Mary College.—Governor Spotswood.—Blackbeard.—Carolina.—Its Constitution.—Conflict of Parties.—Georgia.

CHAPTER VI. GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE COLONIES . . . . .	119
--	-----

Origin of American Political Institutions.—Local Self-government.—Representation.—Relation of Colonies to England.—Classification of Colonies.—Changes.—Conflict of Legal Views.—Colonists' Contentions.—Taxation.

CHAPTER VII. SOCIAL CULTURE IN COLONIAL TIMES . . . . .	123
---	-----

Population of the Colonies at Different Dates.—Differences according to Sections.—Intellectual Ability.—Free Thought.—Political Bent.—English Church in the Colonies.—Its Clergy.—In New York.—The New England Establishment.—Hatred to Episcopacy.—Counter-hatred.—Colleges and Schools.—Newspapers.—Libraries.—Postal System.—Learned Professions.—Epidemics.—Scholars and Artists.—Travelling.—Manufactures and Commerce.—Houses.—Food and Dress.—Wigs.—Opposition to Them.—Social Cleavage.—Redemptioners.—Penal Legislation.—Philadelphia Leads in Social Science.

CHAPTER VIII. ENGLAND AND FRANCE IN AMERICA . . . . .	136
--	-----

The French in the Heart of the Continent.—Groseilliers, Radisson, La Salle.—Joliet and Marquette Reach the Mississippi.—

Baudin and Du Lhut.—La Salle Descends to the Gulf.—“Chicago.”—The Portages.—La Salle’s Expedition from France to the Mississippi.—Its Fate.—French, Indians, and English.—France’s Advantage.—Numbers of each Race in America.—Causes of England’s Colonial Strength.—King William’s War.—The Schenectady Massacre.—Other Atrocities.—Anne’s War.—Deerfield.—Plans for Striking Back.—Second Capture of Port Royal.—Rasle’s Settlement Raided.—George’s War.—Capture of Louisburg.—Saratoga Destroyed.—Scheme to Retaliate.—Failure.—French Vigilance and Aggression.

	PAGE
CHAPTER IX. THE FRENCH AND INDIAN	
WAR . . . . .	146

Struggle Inevitable.—George Washington.—Fights at Great Meadows.—War Begun.—English Plans of Campaign.—Braddock’s March.—Defeat and Death.—Prophecy Regarding Washington.—The “Evangeline” History.—London’s Incompetence.—Pitt at the Head of Affairs.—Will Take Canada.—Louisburg Recaptured.—“Pittsburgh.”—Triple Movement upon Canada.—The Plains of Abraham.—Quebec Capitulates.—Peace of Paris.—Conspiracy of Pontiac.

### PERIOD III

#### *REVOLUTION AND THE OLD CONFEDERATION*

1763-1789

CHAPTER I. RESULTS OF THE FRENCH AND INDIAN	
WAR . . . . .	154

How Important.—Vergennes’s Prophecy.—England in Debt.—Tempted to Tax Colonies.—Colonies Strengthened.—Military Experience Gained.—Leaders Trained.—Fighting Power Revealed.—Best of All, Union.—How Developed.—Nothing but War could have done This.—Scattered Condition of Population Then.—Difficulties of Communication.—Other Centrifugal

gal Influences.—France no longer a Menace to the Colonies.—  
But a Natural Friend and Ally.—Increase of Territory at the  
Colonies' Disposal.

	PAGE
CHAPTER II. GEORGE III. AND HIS AMERICAN COLONIES . . . . .	161

Character of the Young King.—Policy.—Advisers.—Indefinite  
Causes Separating Colonies from England.—England Blind to  
These.—Ignorant of the Colonies.—Stricter Enforcement of Navi-  
gation Laws.—Writs of Assistance.—James Otis.—Stamp Act.  
—Opposition.—Vigorous and Widespread Retaliation by Non-  
importation.—England Recedes.—Her Side of the Question.—  
Lord Mansfield's Argument.—Pitt's.—Constitutional and Historical  
Considerations not Sufficient.—George III.'s Case Better  
Legally than Practically.—Natural Rights.—Townshend's Duties.  
—Massachusetts Opposition.—Samuel Adams.—Committees of  
Correspondence.—The Billeting Act.—Boston Massacre.—State-  
ment of Grievances.—The Tea.—Coercion Resolved Upon.—  
First Continental Congress.—Drifting into War.

CHAPTER III. INDEPENDENCE AND THE NEW STATES . . . . .	171
---	-----

Slow Growth of Desire for Independence.—Why.—Early  
Schemes of Union.—New York Convention of 1690.—Albany  
Convention of 1754.—Franklin's Plan for a Confederation of  
Colonies.—Even in 1774 no Hint of Independence.—Hardly in  
1775.—Swift Change at Last.—All the Colonies Turn to the New  
Idea.—Causes.—Dickinson and Harrison.—The King's Barbar-  
ity.—The Gaspé Affair.—Capture of Fort William and Mary.—  
Paine's "Common Sense."—Declaration of Independence Moot-  
ed.—Debated.—Drafted.—Passed and Signed.—Jefferson.—  
How far he Followed Earlier Utterances.—Effect of the Declara-  
tion.—Anarchy in the Colonies.—New State Governments.—  
New Constitutions.—Their Provisions.—Changes from the Old  
Order.—General Character of the Documents.

CHAPTER IV. OUTBREAK OF WAR: WASHINGTON'S MOVEMENTS . . . . . 181

General Gage in Boston.—Lexington.—Concord.—The Retreat.—Siege of Boston.—Bunker Hill.—Warren's Fall.—Losses of the two Sides.—Washington Commander-in-Chief.—His Character.—Difficulties.—Bad Military System.—Gage Evacuates Boston.—Moultrie's Defence of Charleston Harbor.—New York the Centre of Hostilities.—Long Island Given Up.—New York City also.—Forts Washington and Lee Captured.—Retreat Across New Jersey.—Splendid Stroke at Trenton.—Princeton.—Brandywine and Germantown.—The Winter at Valley Forge.—Hardships.—Steuben's Arrival and Drill.—Battle of Monmouth.

CHAPTER V. THE NORTHERN CAMPAIGN . . . 189

On to Canada.—Ethan Allen takes "Old Ti."—Montgomery's Advance.—Benedict Arnold's.—They Attack Quebec—Montgomery Falls.—Morgan in the Lower Town.—The Siege Raised.—Retreat.—Burgoyne's Advance.—The British Plan.—Ticonderoga Again in British Hands.—On to Fort Edward.—St. Leger's Expedition.—Battle of Oriskany.—St. Leger Driven Back.—Banme's Expedition.—Battle of Bennington.—Stark.—Burgoyne in a *Cul-de-sac*.—Gates Succeeds Schuyler.—First Battle of Bemis's Heights or Stillwater.—Burgoyne's Position Critical.—No Tidings from Clinton.—Second Battle—Arnold the Hero.—The Briton Retreats.—Capitulates.—Little Thanks to Gates.—Importance of Burgoyne's Surrender.

CHAPTER VI. THE SOUTHERN CAMPAIGNS . . 196

Massacres of Wyoming and Cherry Valley.—Battle of Rhode Island.—Raids.—Wayne takes Stony Point.—Paul Jones and his Naval Victory.—The War in the South.—Lincoln Surrenders.—All South Carolina Gone.—Clinton's Severity.—Bravely withstood by Southern Leaders and People.—Washington Sends Aid.—Gates and De Kalb.—Battle of Camden.—Exit Gates.—De Kalb's Valor and Death.—Arnold's Treason.—The South

Prostrate.—Colonial Victory of King's Mountain.—General Greene to the South.—His History.—His Plan.—Morgan Beats Carleton at Cowpens.—Cornwallis Sweeps Northward.—Greene's Skilful Retreat.—Battle of Guilford Court-house.—Cornwallis to Virginia.—The Carolinas and Georgia Recovered.—Washington to Yorktown.—French Aid.—Cornwallis Surrenders.—Effects.

CHAPTER VII. PEACE . . . . . PAGE  
205

Peace Sentiment in England.—Reasons.—Ill Conduct of the War.—Expense.—Vain Concession.—France Aids America.—Spain Too.—Lord North Wavers.—Holland Joins the Colonies.—Cornwallis's Surrender.—Franklin in France.—Influence and Skill.—Joy.—Negotiations for a Treaty of Peace.—The Treaty Signed.—Its Provisions.—Peace a Benediction.—Cessation of Hostilities.—Redcoats Depart.—New York Evacuated.—Washington's Adieu to the Army.—Resigns his Commission.—Re-visits Mount Vernon.

CHAPTER VIII. AMERICAN MANHOOD IN THE  
REVOLUTION . . . . . 213

Character of Revolutionary Soldiers.—Causes.—Physical Basis and Previous Training.—Bunker Hill.—Moultrie.—Marylanders at Long Island.—At Monmouth.—Nathan Hale.—André.—Paul Jones and his Exploit.—Ethan Allen.—Prescott.—"Old Put."—Richard Montgomery.—General Greene.—Stark.—Dan Morgan.—Other Generals.—Colonel Washington.—De Kalb.—Robert Morris, Financier.—Franklin Diplomatist.—Washington.—Military Ability.—Mental and Moral Characteristics.—Honesty.—Modesty.—Encomia upon Him.

CHAPTER IX. THE OLD CONFEDERATION . . . . . 223

The Revolutionary Congress.—The Articles of Confederation.—Synopsis.—Congress.—Its Powers.—Advantages of the Confederation.—Critical State of Affairs after the War.—State Sovereignty.—Antagonized by Existence of the Articles.—

Faults of the Confederation.—No Power over Individuals.—Treaties.—Taxation.—War Debt.—Mutinous Spirit in Army.—Washington's Steadfastness.—Congress Menaced.—Discord of Commercial Laws.—England's Hostile Attitude.—Needed Amendments to the Articles.—Lack of a Central Power.—North-west Territory.—Ordinance of 1787.—Its Excellence.—The Ohio Company.—Settlement at Marietta.

PAGE

CHAPTER X. RISE OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION 230

Anarchy after the Revolution.—Shays's Rebellion.—Washington's Influence.—Continental Sects.—Hamilton's Motion for a Stronger Government.—Massachusetts's Motion.—Forwardness of Virginia.—Of Madison.—Origin of Annapolis Convention, 1786.—Its Action.—Meeting of the Constitutional Convention, 1787.—The Virginia Plan.—New Jersey Plan.—Growth of the Constitution.—Personnel of the Convention.—Its Distinguished Men.—Subsequent Careers of Many.—Rutledge.—Rufus King.—Completion of the Constitution.—Ratification.—Struggle in Massachusetts.—In Virginia.—In New York.—In North Carolina.—In Rhode Island.—“ More Perfect Union ” at Last.

## Part Second

THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE  
CONSTITUTION

## PERIOD I

THE UNITED STATES AND THE FRENCH  
REVOLUTION

1789-1814

CHAPTER I. THE NEW GOVERNMENT . . . . . PAGE  
243

Lanching the Constitution.—Washington's First Inauguration.—Distribution of our Population in 1790.—In the States.—Cities.—New York City.—Difference between the Old Government and the New.—Status of the State.—Benefits of the New Order.—Popularity of the Constitution.—Thoroughness of First Congress.—Origin of Post-office Department.—Treasury.—Revenue and Monetary System.—Judiciary.—Secretary of War.—Leaders in First Congress.

## CHAPTER II. FEDERALISM AND ANTI-FEDERALISM . . . . . 254

Origin and Development of the Two Terms.—Policy of Federalism.—Federalists Aristocratic.—Two Stripes of Federalists.—Policy of the Anti-federalists.—Close and Liberal Constructionists.—Argument of the Federalists on Article I., Section 8.—Reply of Anti-federalists.—Historical Facts in Support of the Latter.

## CHAPTER III. DOMESTIC QUESTIONS OF WASHINGTON'S ADMINISTRATIONS . . . . . 258

I. TARIFF: Restrictive Policy after the Revolution.—Object of its Advocates to Strengthen the Central Government.—Re-



taliatory Spirit against England.—Desire for Independence as to Military Supplies.

II. FUNDING THE DEBT: Debt at Close of Revolution.—Congress Liquidates the Domestic Federal Debt.—Assumes State Debts.—Debate on This.—Secured by a “Deal.”—Scheme for Payment.

III.—THE EXCISE: Excise on Spirits.—Opposition in Pennsylvania.—Result.

IV. THE BANK: Chartered by Congress.—Hostility.—Jefferson’s Argument.—Hamilton’s.—Good Influence of the Bank.

CHAPTER IV. RELATIONS WITH ENGLAND . . . . . PAGE 263

Revolution in France.—Washington’s Proclamation of Neutrality.—Jefferson’s Criticism.—Rives’s.—Arguments for Aiding France.—Results of Neutrality.—Federalist Leaning toward Great Britain.—Attitude of Great Britain.—Impressment of our Seamen.—War Imminent.—Jay’s Treaty.—Fisher Ames Urges Ratification.

CHAPTER V. RELATIONS WITH THE FRENCH REPUBLIC . . . . . 269

Federalists Condemn, Republicans Favor the French Revolution.—Causes of its Popularity.—Justification of the Administration’s Policy.—France Violates the Treaty.—Genet’s High-handed Action.—His Insolence and Final Removal.—Effect of Jay’s Treaty upon France.—Further Overtures to France.—Result.—Anti-federalists Confounded.—War Feeling in this Country.—Adams’s Patriotic Course.—War Averted.

CHAPTER VI. DECLINE OF THE FEDERALIST PARTY . . . . . 275

Federalist Excesses.—Alien and Sedition Acts.—Conviction of Matthew Lyon.—Results of the Federalist Policy.—Its Animus.—Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions.—These Criticised.—Unpopularity of the Federalist Measures.—This Dooms Federalism.—Federalist Dissensions.—Federalist Opposition to the Administration.—Waning Power of Federalism.—Its Good After-influence.

	PAGE
CHAPTER VII. THE WEST . . . . .	282

Kentucky and Tennessee become States.—Unorganized and Organized Territory.—Settlements in the Northwest.—Centres of Population.—Early Land System.—Indian Outbreaks.—Harmar's Expedition.—Treaty with the Creeks.—Expedition of St. Clair.—Forts Built.—St. Clair's Defeat.—His Deposition from Military Command.—Wayne's Victory.—Pioneer Life.—Indiana Territory Formed.—Ohio a State.—System of Marketing Public Lands.—Mississippi Territory Organized.

CHAPTER VIII. SOCIAL CULTURE AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY . . . . .	291
--	-----

Population.—Rural Life.—Theatres.—Sports.—Lotteries.—Steam Navigation.—The Old-fashioned Muster.—Intemperance.—Introduction of Sunday-schools.—Spanish Coins.—Colonial Money still in Use.—“Fip,” “Levy,” “Pistareen.”—Newspapers and Postal Arrangements.—Party Strife.—Innovations and Inventions.—Beginnings of the American Factory System.—Oliver Evans.—Samuel Slater.

CHAPTER IX. DEMOCRACY AT THE HELM . . . . .	305
---	-----

Jefferson's Election.—XIIth Amendment to the Constitution.—Power of Democracy.—Its Policy.—Jefferson the Typical Democrat.—His Character.—His Civil Service Policy.—Burr's Rise.—Shoots Hamilton in a Duel.—His Treason.—His Arrest.—Purchase of Louisiana.—Immense Increase of Territory.—Trouble with the Barbary Powers.—Their Insolence.—Dale's Expedition.—Further Successes.

CHAPTER X. THE WAR OF 1812 . . . . .	315
--------------------------------------	-----

Great Britain Ignores International Law.—Impresses American Seamen.—The Chesapeake Affair.—Navigation Act and Berlin Decree.—England Questions our Neutrality.—Preparations for War.—Ill Success of Land Operations.—Harrison's Victory over Proctor.—Jackson Conquers the Creeks.—Battle

of New Orleans.—Naval Victories.—Battle of Lake Erie.—Opposition of the Federalists to the War.—New England Remonstrances.—Attitude of Sects.—Treaty of Ghent.—Its Provisions.

## PERIOD II

WHIGS AND DEMOCRATS TILL THE  
DOMINANCE OF THE SLAVERY  
CONTROVERSY

1814-1840

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. THE WHIG PARTY AND ITS MIS-	
SION . . . . .	325

The Word "Whig"—Republican Prestige.—Schism.—Adams's Election.—Five Doctrines of Whiggism.—I. *Broad Construction* of the Constitution.—II. The *Bank*.—Death of Old and Birth of New.—Opposition by Jackson.—III. *The Tariff* of 1816.—Its Object.—IV. *Land*.—Whig versus Democratic Policy.—V. *Internal Improvements*.—Rivers and Harbors.—Need of Better Inland Communication.—Contention between the Parties.—Whig Characteristics.—Adams.—Webster.—His Political Attitude.—Clay.—His Power as an Orator.—His Duel with Randolph.—His Wit.—His Influence.

CHAPTER II. FLORIDA AND THE MONROE DOC-	
TRINE . . . . .	336

Florida's Disputed Boundary.—West Florida Occupied.—Jackson Seizes East Florida.—Puts to Death Ambrister and Arbuthnot.—His Excuse.—Defended by Adams.—Sale of Florida.—Revolt of Spanish America.—Monroe's Declaration.—Its Origin.

CHAPTER III. THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE . . . . .	341
--	-----

Missouri Wishes Statehood.—Early History of Slavery.—Hostility to it.—First Abolitionist Societies.—Ordinance of 1787.—

Slavery in the North.—In the South.—Pleas for its Existence.—Missouri Compromise.—Pro-slavery Arguments.—The Policy Men.—Anti-slavery Opinions.—Difficulties of the Case.—The Anti-slavery Side Ignores These.

PAGE

CHAPTER IV. THE GREAT NULLIFICATION . . . . . 348

Rise of Tariff Rates after 1816.—Relations of Parties and Sections to the Tariff.—Minimum Principle.—Tariff of Abominations Adopted.—Harmful to the South.—Nullification Project.—Calhoun's Life and Pet Political Theory.—South Carolina Recedes.—Compromise Tariff.—State Rights and Central Government.—Webster's Plea.

CHAPTER V. MINOR PUBLIC QUESTIONS OF  
JACKSON'S "REIGN" . . . . . 355

Jackson's Life.—Mistaken Ideas.—Civil Service Reform.—Perfecting of Party Organization in the Country.—Jackson and the United States Bank.—His Popularity.—Revival of West Indian Trade.—French Spoliation Claims.—Paid.—Our Gold and Silver Coinage.—Gold Bill.—Increased Circulation of Gold.—Specie Circular.

CHAPTER VI. THE FIRST WHIG TRIUMPH . . . . . 363

Election of Harrison in 1840.—Causes.—Jackson's Violence.—Sub-treasury Policy.—Panic of 1837.—Decrease of Revenue.—Whig Opposition to Slavery.—Seminole War.—Amistad Case.—Texan Question.—"Tippecanoe and Tyler too."

CHAPTER VII. LIFE AND MANNERS IN THE  
FOURTH DECADE . . . . . 370

Population and Area.—The West.—The East.—An American Literature.—Newspaper Enterprise, Mails, Eleemosynary Institutions.—American Character.—Temperance Reform.—The Land of the Free.—Religion.—Anti-masonic Movement.—

Banking Craze.—Moon Hoax.—Party Spirit.—Jackson as a Knight Errant.—His Self-will.—Enmity between Adams and Jackson.—Costumes.

CHAPTER VIII. INDUSTRIAL ADVANCE BY 1840 PAGE  
382

F. C. Lowell and his Waltham Power-loom.—Growth of Factory System.—New Corporation Laws.—Gas, Coal, and Other Industries.—The Same Continued.—The National Road.—Stages and Canals.—Ocean Lines.—Beginning of Railroads.—Opposition.—First Locomotive.—Multiplication of Railroads.

## LIST OF MAPS

	FACE PAGE
EUROPEAN PROVINCES, 1655 . . . . .	60
THE UNITED COLONIES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE REVOLUTION . . . . .	180
MAP SHOWING THE PROGRESSIVE ACQUISITION OF TERRITORY BY THE UNITED STATES .	250

## INTRODUCTION

### *AMERICA BEFORE COLUMBUS*

MAN made his appearance on the western continent unnumbered ages ago, not unlikely before the close of the glacial period. It is possible that human life began in Asia and western North America sooner than on either shore of the Atlantic. Nothing wholly forbids the belief that America was even the cradle of the race, or one of several cradles, though most scientific writers prefer the view that our species came hither from Asia. De Nadaillac judges it probable that the ocean was thus crossed not at Behring Strait alone, but along a belt of equatorial islands as well. We may think of successive waves of such immigration—perhaps the easiest way to account for certain differences among American races.

It is, at any rate, an error to speak of the primordial Americans as derived from any Asiatic stock at present existing or known to history. The old Americans had scarcely an Asiatic feature. Their habits and customs were emphatically peculiar to themselves. Those in which they agreed with the trans-Pacific populations, such as fashion of weapons and of fortifications, elements of folk-lore, religious ideas, traditions of a flood,

belief in the destruction of the world by fire, and so on, are nearly all found the world over, the spontaneous creations of our common human intelligence.

The original American peoples, various and unlike as they were, agreed in four traits, three of them physical, one mental, which mark them off as in all likelihood primarily of one stock after all, and as different from any Old World men: 1. They had low, retreating foreheads. 2. Their hair was black. 3. It was also of a peculiar texture, lank and cylindrical in section, never wavy. And 4, their languages were polysynthetic, forming a class apart from all others in the world. The peoples of America, if from Asia, must date back to a time when speech itself was in its infancy.

The numerous varieties of ancient Americans reduce to two distinct types—the Dolicocephalous or long-skulled, and the Brachycephalous or short-skulled. Morton names these types respectively the Toltecan and the American proper. The Toltecan type was represented by the primitive inhabitants of Mexico and by the Mound-builders of our Mississippi Valley; the American proper by the Indians. The Toltecan made far the closer approach to civilization, though the others possessed a much greater susceptibility therefor than the modern Indians of our prairies would indicate.

Of the Mound-builders painfully little is known. Many of their mounds still remain, not less mysterious or interesting than the pyramids of Egypt, perhaps almost equally ancient. The skeletons



exhumed from them often fly into dust as soon as exposed to air, a rare occurrence with the oldest bones found in Europe. On the parapet-crest of the Old Fort at Newark, O., trees certainly five hundred years old have been cut, and they could not have begun their growth till long after the earth-works had been deserted. In some mounds, equally aged trees root in the decayed trunks of a still anterior growth.

Much uncertainty continues to shroud the design of these mounds. Some were for military defence, others for burial places, others for lookout stations, others apparently for religious uses. Still others, it is supposed, formed parts of human dwellings. That they proceeded from intelligence and reflection is clear. Usually, whether they are squares or circles, their construction betrays nice, mathematical exactness, unattainable save by the use of instruments. Many constitute effigies—of birds, fishes, quadrupeds, men. In Wisconsin is a mound 135 feet long and well proportioned, much resembling an elephant; in Adams County, O., a gracefully curved serpent, 1,000 feet long, with jaws agape as if to swallow an egg-shaped figure in front; in Granville, in the same State, one in the form of a huge crocodile; in Greenup County, Ky., an image of a bear, which seems leaning forward in an attitude of observation, measuring fifty-three feet from the top of the back to the end of the foreleg, and  $105\frac{1}{2}$  feet from the tip of the nose to the rear of the hind foot.

The sites of towns and cities were artfully selected, near navigable rivers and their confluences,

as at Marietta, Cincinnati, and in Kentucky opposite the old mouth of the Scioto. Points for defence were chosen and fortified with scientific precision. The labor expended upon these multitudinous structures must have been enormous, implying a vast population and extensive social, economic, and civil organization. The Cahokia mound, opposite St. Louis, is ninety feet high and 900 feet long.

The Mound-builders made elegant pottery, of various design and accurate shapes, worked bone and all sorts of stones, and even forged copper. There are signs that they understood smelting this metal. They certainly mined it in large quantities and carried it down the Mississippi hundreds of miles from its source on Lake Superior. They must have been masters of river navigation, but their mode of conveying vast burdens overland, destitute of efficient draft animals as they apparently were, we can hardly even conjecture.

The Mound-builders, as we have said, were related to the antique populations of Mexico and Central America, and the most probable explanation of their departure from their Northern seats is that in face of pestilence, or of some overpowering human foe, they retreated to the Southwest, there to lay, under better auspices, the foundations of new states, and to develop that higher civilization whose relics, too little known, astound the student of the past, as greatly as do the stupendous pillars of Carnac or the grotesque animal figures of Khorsabad and Nimrud.

So much has been written about the American

Indians that we need not discuss them at length. They were misnamed Indians by Columbus, who supposed the land he had discovered to be India. At the time of his arrival not more than two hundred thousand of them lived east of the Mississippi, though they were doubtless far more numerous West and South. Whence they came or whether, if this was a human deed at all, they or another race now extinct drove out the Mound-builders, none can tell.

Of arts the red man had but the rudest. He made wigwams, canoes, bone fish-hooks with lines of hide or twisted bark, stone tomahawks, arrow-heads and spears, clothing of skins, wooden bows, arrows, and clubs. He loved fighting, finery, gambling, and the chase. He domesticated no animals but the dog and possibly the hog. Sometimes brave, he was oftener treacherous, cruel, revengeful. His power of endurance on the trail or the warpath was incredible, and if captured, he let himself be tortured to death without a quiver or a cry. Though superstitious, he believed in a Great Spirit to be worshipped without idols, and in a future life of happy hunting and feasting.

Whether, at the time of which we now speak, the Indians were an old race, already beginning to decline, or a fresh race, which contact with the whites balked of its development, it is difficult to say. Their career since best accords with the former supposition. In either case we may assume that their national groupings and habitats were nearly the same in 1500 as later, when these became accurately known. In the eighteenth cen-

tury the Algonquins occupied all the East from Nova Scotia to North Carolina, and stretched west to the Mississippi. At one time they numbered ninety thousand. The Iroquois or Five Nations had their seat in Central and Western New York. North and west of them lived the Hurons or Wyandots. The Appalachians, embracing Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Seminoles, and a number of lesser tribes, occupied all the southeastern portion of what is now the United States. West of the Mississippi were the Dakotas or Sioux.

Since the white man's arrival upon these shores, very few changes have occurred among the brute inhabitants of North America. A few species, as the Labrador duck and the great auk, have perished. America then possessed but four animals which had appreciable economic value; the dog, the reindeer at the north, which the mound-builders used as a draft animal but the Indians did not, and the llama and the paco south of the equator. Every one of our present domestic animals originated beyond the Atlantic, being imported hither by our ancestors. The Indians of the lower Mississippi Valley, when De Soto came, had dogs, and also what the Spaniards called hogs, perhaps peccaries, but neither brute was of any breed now bred in the country. A certain kind of dogs were native also to the Juan Fernandez and the Falkland Islands.

Mr. Edward John Payne is doubtless correct in maintaining, in his "History of the New World called America," that the backwardness of the

American aborigines was largely due to their lack of animals suitable for draft or travel or producing milk or flesh good for food. From the remotest antiquity Asiatics had the horse, ass, ox and cow, camel and goat—netting ten times the outfit in useful animals which the Peruvians, Mexicans, or Indians enjoyed.

The vegetable kingdom of Old America was equally restricted, which also helps explain its low civilization. At the advent of the Europeans the continent was covered with forests. Then, though a few varieties may have since given out and some imported ones run wild, the undomesticated plants and trees were much as now. Not so the cultivated kinds. The Indians were wretched husbandmen, nor had the Mound-builders at all the diversity of agricultural products so familiar to us. Tobacco, Indian-corn, cocoa, sweet potatoes, potatoes, the custard apple, the Jerusalem artichoke, the guava, the pumpkin and squash, the papaw and the pineapple, indigenous to North America, had been under cultivation here before Columbus came, the first four from most ancient times. The manioc or tapioca-plant, the red-pepper plant, the marmalade plum and the tomato were raised in South America before 1500. The persimmon, the cinchona-tree, millet, the Virginia and the Chili strawberry are natives of this continent, but have been brought under cultivation only within the last three centuries.

The three great cereals, wheat, rye, oats, and rice, constituting all our main food crops but corn, have come to us from Europe. So have cherries,

quinces, and pears, also hops, currants, chestnuts, and mushrooms. The banana, regarded by von Humboldt as an original American fruit, modern botanists derive from Asia. With reference to apples there may be some question. Apples of a certain kind flourished in New England so early after the landing of the Pilgrims that it is difficult to suppose the fruit not to have been indigenous to this continent. Champlain, in 1605 or 1606, found the Indians about the present sites of Portland, Boston, and Plymouth in considerable agricultural prosperity, with fields of corn and tobacco, gardens rich in melons, squashes, pumpkins, and beans, the culture of none of which had they apparently learned from white men. Mr. Payne's generalization, that superior food-supply occasioned the Old World's primacy in civilization, and also that of the Mexicans and Peruvians here, seems too sweeping, yet it evidently contains large truth.

**PART FIRST**

**THE FORE-HISTORY**





## PERIOD I.

### *DISCOVERY AND SETTLEMENT*

1492-1660

## CHAPTER I.

### COLUMBUS

THERE is no end to the accounts of alleged discoveries of America before Columbus. Most of these are fables. It is, indeed, nearly certain that hardy Basque, Breton, and Norman fishermen, adventuring first far north, then west, had sighted Greenland and Labrador, and become well acquainted with the rich fishing-grounds about Newfoundland and the Saint Lawrence Gulf. Many early charts of these regions, without dates, and hitherto referred to Portuguese navigators of a time so late as 1500, are now thought to be the work of these earlier voyagers. They found the New World, but considered it a part of the Old.

Important, too, is the story of supposed Norse sea-rovers hither, derived from certain Icelandic manuscripts of the fourteenth century. It is a pleasing narrative, that of Lief Ericson's sail in 1000-1001 to Helluland, Markland, and at last to Vineland, and of the subsequent tours by Thorwald Ericson in 1002, Thorfinn Karlsefne, 1007-

1009, and of Helge and Finnborge in 1011, to points still farther away. Such voyages probably occurred. As is well known, Helluland has been interpreted to be Newfoundland; Markland, Nova Scotia; and Vineland the country bordering Mount Hope Bay in Bristol, R. I. These identifications are possibly correct, and even if they are mistaken, Vineland may still have been somewhere upon the coast of what is now the United States.

In the present condition of the evidence, however, we have to doubt this. No scholar longer believes that the writing on Dighton Rock is Norse, or that the celebrated Skeleton in Armor found at Fall River was a Northman's, or that the old Stone Mill at Newport was constructed by men from Iceland. Even if the manuscripts, composed between three and four hundred years after the events which they are alleged to narrate, are genuine, and if the statements contained in them are true, the latter are far too indefinite to let us be sure that they are applicable to United States localities.

But were we to go so far as to admit that the Northmen came here and began the settlements ascribed to them, they certainly neither appreciated nor published their exploits. Their colony, wherever it was, endured but for a day, and it, with its locality, speedily passed from knowledge in Scandinavia itself. America had not yet, in effect, been discovered.

We must remember that long anterior to Columbus's day unbiassed and thoughtful men had come to believe the earth to be round. They also

knew that Europe constituted but a small part of it. In the year 1260 the Venetian brothers Niccolò and Maffeo Polo made their way to China, the first men from Western Europe ever to travel so far. They returned in 1269, but in 1271 set out again, accompanied by Niccolò's son, a youth of seventeen. This son was the famous Marco Polo, whose work, "The Wonders of the World," reciting his extended journeys through China and the extreme east and southeast of Asia, and his eventful voyage home by sea, ending in 1295, has come down to our time, one of the most interesting volumes in the world. Friar Orderic's eastern travels in 1322-1330, as appropriated by Sir John Mandeville, were published before 1371.

Columbus knew these writings, and the reading and re-reading of them had made him an enthusiast. In Polo's book he had learned of Mangi and Far Cathay, with their thousands of gorgeous cities, the meanest finer than any then in Europe; of their abounding mines pouring forth infinite wealth, their noble rivers, happy populations, curious arts, and benign government. Polo had told him of Cambalu (Peking), winter residence of the Great Khan, Kublai—Cambalu with its palaces of marble, golden-roofed, its guard of ten thousand soldiers, its imperial stables containing five thousand elephants, its unnumbered army, navy, and merchant marine; of oxen huge as elephants; of richest spices, nuts large as melons, canes fifteen yards long, silks, cambrics, and the choicest furs; and of magic Cipango (Japan), island of pearls, whose streets were paved with gold.

Columbus believed all this, and it co-operated with his intense and even bigoted religious faith to kindle in him an all-consuming ambition to reach this distant Eden by sea, that he might carry the Gospel to those opulent heathen and partake their unbounded temporal riches in return. Poor specimen of a saint as Columbus is now known to have been, he believed himself divinely called to this grand enterprise.

Christopher Columbus, or Christobal Colon, as he always signed himself after he entered the service of Spain, was born in Genoa about 1456. Little is certainly known of his early life. His father was a humble wool-carder. The youth possessed but a sorry education, spite of his few months at the University of Pavia. At the age of fourteen he became a sailor, knocking about the world in the roughest manner, half the time practically a pirate. In an all-day's sea fight, once, his ship took fire and he had to leap overboard; but being a strong swimmer he swam, aided by an oar, eight leagues to land.

From 1470 to 1484 we find him in Portugal, the country most interested and engaged then in ocean-going and discovery. Here he must have known Martin Behem, author of the famous globe, finished in 1492, whereon Asia is exhibited as reaching far into the same hemisphere with Europe. Prince Henry of Portugal earnestly patronized all schemes for exploration and discovery, and the daughter, Philippa, of one of his captains, Perestrello, Columbus married. With her he lived at Porto Santo in the Madeiras, where he became

familiar with Correo, her sister's husband, also a distinguished navigator. The islanders fully believed in the existence of lands in the western Atlantic. West winds had brought to them strange woods curiously carved, huge cane-brakes like those of India described by Ptolemy, peculiarly fashioned canoes, and corpses with skin of a hue unknown to Europe or Africa.

Reflecting on these things, studying Perestrello's and Correo's charts and accounts of their voyages, corresponding with Toscanelli and other savans, himself an adept in drawing maps and sea-charts, for a time his occupation in Lisbon, cruising here and there, once far northward to Iceland, and talking with navigators from every Atlantic port, Columbus became acquainted with the best geographical science of his time.

This had convinced him that India could be reached by sailing westward. The theoretical possibility of so doing was of course admitted by all who held the earth to be a sphere, but most regarded it practically impossible in the then condition of navigation, to sail the necessary distance. Columbus considered the earth far smaller than was usually thought, a belief which we find hinted at so early as 1447, upon the famous *mappemonde* of the Pitti Palace in Florence, whereon Europe appears projected far round to the north-west. Columbus seems to have viewed this extension as a sort of yoke joining India to Scandinavia by the north. He judged that Asia, or at least Cipango, stretched two-thirds of the way to Europe, India being twice as near westward as

eastward. Thirty or forty days he deemed sufficient for making it. Toscanelli and Behem as well as he held this belief ; he dared boldly to act upon it. <sup>1</sup>

But to do so required resources. There are indications that Columbus at some time, perhaps more than once, urged his scheme upon Genoa and Venice. If so it was in vain. Nor can we tell whether such an attempt, if made, was earlier or later than his plea before the court of Portugal, for this cannot be dated. The latter was probably in 1484. King John II. was impressed, and referred Columbus's scheme to a council of his wisest advisers, who denounced it as visionary. Hence in 1485 or 1486 Columbus proceeded to Spain to lay his project before Ferdinand and Isabella.

On the way he stopped at a Franciscan convent near Palos, begging bread for himself and son. The Superior, Marchena, became interested in him, and so did one of the Pinzons—famous navigators of Palos. The king and queen were at the time holding court at Cordova, and thither Columbus went, fortified with a recommendation from Marchena. The monarchs were engrossed in the final conquest of Granada, and Columbus had to wait through six weary and heart-sickening years before royal attention was turned to his cause. It must have been during this delay that he despatched his brother Bartholomew to England with an appeal to Henry VII. Christopher had brought Alexander Geraldinus, the scholar, and also the Archbishop of Toledo, to

espouse his mission, and finally, at the latter's instance, Ferdinand, as John of Portugal had done, went so far as to convene, at Salamanca, a council of reputed scholars to pass judgment upon Columbus and his proposition. By these, as by the Portuguese, he was declared a misguided enthusiast. They were too much behind the age even to admit the spherical figure of the earth. According to Scripture, they said, the earth is flat, adding that it was contrary to reason for men to walk heads downward, or snow and rain to ascend, or trees to grow with their roots upward.

The war for Granada ended, Santangel and others of his converts at court secured Columbus an interview with Isabella, but his demands seeming to her arrogant, he was dismissed. Nothing daunted, the hero had started for France, there to plead as he had pleaded in Portugal and Spain already, when to his joy a messenger overtook him with orders to come once more before the queen.

Fuller thought and argument had convinced this eminent woman that the experiment urged by Columbus ought to be tried, and a contract was soon concluded, by which, on condition that he should bear one-eighth the expense of the expedition, the public chest of Castile was to furnish the remainder. The story of the crown jewels having been pledged for this purpose is now discredited. If such pledging occurred, it was earlier, in prosecuting the war with the Moors. The whole sum needed for the voyage was about fifty thousand dollars. Columbus was made admiral, also viceroy of whatever lands should be discovered, and he was

to have ten per cent. of all the revenues from such lands. For his contribution to the outfit he was indebted to the Pinzons.

This arrangement was made in April or May, 1492, and on the third of the next August, after the utmost difficulty in shipping crews for this sail into the sea of darkness, Columbus put out from Palos with one hundred and twenty men, on three ships. These were the *Santa María*, the *Niña*, and the *Pinta*. The largest, the *Santa María*, was of not over one hundred tons, having a deck-length of sixty-three feet, a keel of fifty-one feet, a draft of ten feet six inches, and her mast-head sixty feet above sea-level. She probably had four anchors, with hemp cables.

From Palos they first bore southward to the Canary Islands, into the track of the prevalent east winds, then headed west, for Cipango, as Columbus supposed, but really toward the northern part of Florida. When a little beyond what he regarded the longitude of Cipango, noticing the flight of birds to the southwest, he was induced to follow these, which accident made his landfall occur at Guanahani (San Salvador), in the Bahamas, instead of the Florida coast.

Near midnight, between October 11th and 12th, Columbus, being on the watch, descried a light ahead. About two o'clock on the morning of the 12th the lookout on the *Pinta* distinctly saw land through the moonlight. When it was day they went on shore. The 12th of October, 1492, therefore, was the date on which for the first time, so far as history attests with assurance, a



European foot pressed the soil of this continent. Adding nine days to this to translate it into New Style, we have October 21st as the day answering to that on which Columbus first became sure that his long toil and watching had not been in vain.

The admiral having failed to note its latitude and longitude, it is not known which of the Bahamas was the San Salvador of Columbus, whether Grand Turk Island, Cat (the present San Salvador), Watling, Mariguana, Acklin, or Samana, though the last named well corresponds with his description. Mr. Justin Winsor, however, and with him a majority of the latest critics, believes that Watling's Island was the place. Before returning to Spain, Columbus discovered Cuba, and also Hayti or Española (Hispaniola), on the latter of which islands he built a fort.

In a second voyage, from Cadiz, 1493-1496, the great explorer discovered the Lesser Antilles and Jamaica. In a third, 1498-1500, he came upon Trinidad and the mainland of South America, at the mouth of the Orinoco. This was later by thirteen months and a week than the Cabots' landfall at Labrador or Nova Scotia, though a year before Amerigo Vespucci saw the coast of Brazil. It was during this third absence that Columbus, hated as an Italian and for his undeniable greed, was superseded by Bobadilla, who sent him and his brother home in chains. Soon free again, he sets off in 1502 upon a fourth cruise, in which he reaches the coast of Honduras.

To the day of his death, however, the discoverer of America never suspected that he had brought to

light a new continent. Even during this his last expedition he maintained that the coast he had touched was that of Mangi, contiguous to Cathay, and that nineteen days of travel overland would have taken him to the Ganges. He arrived in Spain on September 12, 1504, and died at Segovia on May 20th of the next year. His bones are believed to rest in the cathedral at Santo Domingo, transported thither in 1541, the Columbus-remains till recently at Havana being those of his son Diego. The latter, under the belief that they were the father's, were transferred to Genoa in 1887, and deposited there on July 2d of that year with the utmost ecclesiastical pomp.

As Columbus was ignorant of having found a new continent, so was he denied the honor of giving it a name, this falling by accident, design, or carelessness of truth, to Amerigo Vespucci, a native of Florence, whose active years were spent in Spain and Portugal. Vespucci made three voyages into the western seas. In the second, 1501, he visited the coast of Brazil, and pushed farther south than any navigator had yet done, probably so far as the Island of South Georgia, in latitude 54°. His account of this voyage found its way into print in 1504, at Augsburg, Germany, the first published narrative of any discovery of the mainland. Although, as above noted, it was not the earliest discovery of the main, it was widely regarded such, and caused Vespucci to be named for many years as the peer, if not the superior of Columbus. The publication ran through many editions. That of Strassburg, 1505, mentioned

Vespucci on its title-page as having discovered a new "Southern Land." This is the earliest known utterance hinting at the continental nature of the new discovery, as separate from Asia, an idea which grew into a conviction only after Magellan's voyage, described in the next chapter. In 1507 appeared at St. Dié, near Strassburg, a four-page pamphlet by one Lud, secretary to the Duke of Lorraine, describing Vespucci's voyages and speaking of the Indians as the "American race." This pamphlet came out the same year in another form, as part of a book entitled "Introduction to Cosmography," prepared by Martin Waldseemüller, under the *nom de plume* of "Hylacomylus." In this book the new "part of the world" is distinctly called "THE LAND OF AMERICUS, OR AMERICA." There is some evidence that Vespucci at least connived at the misapprehension which brought him his renown—as undeserved as it has become permanent—but this cannot be regarded as proved.



## CHAPTER II.

### EARLY SPANISH AMERICA

As we have seen, Spain by no means deserves the entire credit of bringing the western continent to men's knowledge. Columbus himself was an Italian. So was Marco Polo, his inspirer, and also Toscanelli, his instructor, by whose chart he sailed his ever-memorable voyage. To Portugal as well Columbus was much indebted, despite his rebuff there. Portugal then led the world in the art of navigation and in enthusiasm for discovery. Nor, probably, would Columbus have asked her aid in vain, had she not previously committed herself to the enterprise of reaching India eastward, a purpose brilliantly fulfilled when, in 1498, Vasco da Gama rounded the Cape of Good Hope and sailed to Calicut, on the coast of Malabar. Already before this Spain and Portugal were rivals in the search for new lands, and Pope Alexander VI. had had to be appealed to, to fix their fields. By his bull of May 3, 4, 1493, he ordained as the separating line the meridian passing through a point one hundred leagues west of the Azores, where Columbus had observed the needle of his compass to point without deflection toward the north star. Portugal objecting to this boundary as excluding

her from the longitude of the newly found Indies, by the treaty of Tordesillas, June 7, 1494, the two powers, with the Pope's assent, moved the line two hundred and seventy leagues still farther west. At this time neither party dreamed of the complications destined subsequently to arise in reference to the position of this meridian on the other side of the globe.

The meridian of the Tordesillas convention had been supposed still to give Spain all the American discoveries likely to be made, it being ascertained only later that by it Portugal had obtained a considerable part of the South American mainland. Brazil, we know, was, till in 1822 it became independent, a Portuguese dependency. Spain, however, retained both groups of the Antilles with the entire main about the Gulf of Mexico, and became the earliest great principality in the western world.

Before the death of Columbus, Spain had taken firm possession of Cuba, Porto Rico, and St. Domingo, and she stood ready to seize any of the adjoining islands or lands so soon as gold, pearls, or aught else of value should be found there. Cruises of discovery were made in every direction, first, indeed, in Central and South America.

In 1506 de Solis sailed along the eastern coast of Yucatan. In 1513 the governor of a colony on the Isthmus of Darien, Vasco Nuñez de Balboa, from the top of a lofty mountain on the isthmus, saw what is now called the Pacific Ocean. He designated it the South Sea, a name which it habitually bore till far into the eighteenth century. From this time the exploration and settlement of

the western coast, both up and down, went on with little interruption, but this history, somewhat foreign to our theme, we cannot detail.

The same year, 1513, Ponce de Leon, an old Spanish soldier in the wars with the Moors, a companion of Columbus in his second voyage, and till now governor of Porto Rico, began exploration to the northward. Leaving Porto Rico with three ships, he landed on the coast of an unknown country, where he thought to find not only infinite gold but also the much-talked-about fountain of perpetual youth. His landing occurred on Easter Sunday, or *Pascua Florida*, March 27, 1513, and so he named the country Florida. The place was a few miles north of the present town of St. Augustine. Exploring the coast around the southern extremity of the peninsula, he sailed among a group of islands, which he designated the Tortugas. Returning to Porto Rico, he was appointed governor of the new country. He made a second voyage, was attacked by the natives and mortally wounded, and returned to Cuba to die.

Juan de Grijalva explored the south coast of the Gulf of Mexico, from Yucatan toward the Panuco. Interest attaches to this enterprise mainly because the treasure which Grijalva collected aroused the envy and greed of the future conqueror of Mexico, Hernando Cortez.

In 1518, Velasquez, governor of Cuba, sends Cortez westward, with eleven ships and over six hundred men, for the purpose of exploration. He landed at Tabasco, thence proceeded to the Island of San Juan de Ulúa, nearly opposite Vera Cruz,

where he received messengers and gifts from the Emperor Montezuma. Ordered to leave the country, he destroyed his ships and marched directly upon the capital. He seized Montezuma and held him as a hostage for the peaceable conduct of his subjects. The Mexicans took up arms, only to be defeated again and again by the Spaniards. Montezuma became a vassal of the Spanish crown, and covenanted to pay annual tribute. Attempting to reconcile his people to this agreement he was himself assailed and wounded, and, refusing all nourishment, soon after died. With re-enforcements, Cortez completed the conquest of the country, and Mexico became a province of Spain.

Vasquez de Ayllon, one of the auditors of the Island of Santo Domingo, sent two ships from that island to the Bahamas for Indians to be sold as slaves. Driven from their course by the wind, they at length reached the shore of South Carolina, at the mouth of the Wateree River, which they named the Jordan, calling the country Chicora. Though kindly treated by the natives, the ruthless adventurers carried away some seventy of these. One ship was lost, and most of the captives on the others died during the voyage. Vasquez was, by the Emperor, Charles V., King of Spain, made governor of this new province, and again set sail to take possession. But the natives, in revenge for the cruel treatment which they had previously received, made a furious attack upon the invaders. The few survivors of the slaughter returned to Santo Domingo, and the expedition was abandoned. These voyages were in 1520 and 1526.

In connection with the subject of Spanish voyages, a passing notice should be given to one, who, though not of Spanish birth, yet did much to further the progress of discovery on the part of his adopted country. Magellan was a Portuguese navigator who had been a child when Columbus came back in triumph from the West Indies. Refused consideration from King Emmanuel, of Portugal, for a wound received under his flag during the war against Morocco, he renounced his native land and offered his services to the sagacious Charles V., of Spain, who gladly accepted them. With a magnificent fleet, Magellan, in 1519, set sail from Seville, cherishing Columbus's bold purpose, which no one had yet realized, of reaching the East Indies by a westward voyage. After touching at the Canaries, he explored the coast of South America, passed through the strait now called by his name, discovered the Ladrone Islands, and' christened the circumjacent ocean the Pacific.

The illustrious navigator now sailed for the Philippine Islands, so named from Philip, son of Charles V., who succeeded that monarch as Philip II. By the Tordesillas division above described, the islands were properly in the Portuguese hemisphere, but on the earliest maps, made by Spaniards, they were placed twenty-five degrees too far east, and this circumstance, whether accidental or designed, has preserved them to Spain even to the present time. At the Philippine Islands Magellan was killed in an affray with the natives. One of his ships, the *Victoria*, after sailing around the Cape of Good Hope, arrived in Spain, having been



the first to circumnavigate the globe. The voyage had taken three years and twenty-eight days.

The disastrous failure of the expedition of Vasquez de Ayllon to Florida did not discourage attempts on the part of others in the same direction. Velasquez, governor of Cuba, jealous of the success of Cortez in Mexico, had sent Pamphilo de Narvaez to arrest him. In this attempt Narvaez had been defeated and taken prisoner. Undeterred by this failure he had solicited and received of Charles V. the position of governor over Florida, a territory at that time embracing the whole southern part of what is now the United States, and reaching from Cape Sable to the Panuco, or River of Palms, in Mexico. With three hundred men he, in 1528, landed near Appalachee Bay, and marched inland with the hope of opening a country rich and populous. Bitterly was he disappointed. Swamps and forests, wretched wigwams with their squalid inmates everywhere met his view, but no gold was to be found. Discouraged, he and his followers returned to the coast, where almost superhuman toil and skill enabled them to build five boats, in which they hoped to work westward to the Spanish settlements. Embarking, they stole cautiously along the coast for some distance, but were at last driven by a storm upon an island, perhaps Galveston, perhaps Santa Rosa, where Narvaez and most of his men perished. Four of his followers survived to cross Texas to the Gulf of California and reach the town of San Miguel on the west coast of Mexico. Here they found their countrymen, searching as usual for

pearls, gold, and slaves, and by their help they made a speedy return to Spain, heroes of as remarkable an adventure as history records. These unfortunates were the first Europeans to visit New Mexico. Their narrative led to the exploration of that country by Coronado and others, and to the discoveries of Cortez in Lower California.

Ferdinand de Soto, eager to rival the exploits of Cortez in Mexico, and of his former commander, Pizarro, in Peru, offered to conquer Florida at his own expense. Appointed governor-general of Florida and of Cuba, he sailed with seven large and three small vessels. From Espiritu Santo Bay he, in 1539, marched with six hundred men into the country of the Appalachians and discovered the harbor of Pensacola. After wintering at Appalachee he set out into the interior, said to abound in gold and silver. Penetrating northeasterly as far as the Savannah, he found only copper and mica. From here he marched first northwest into northern central Georgia, then southwest into Alabama. A battle was fought with the natives at Mavila, or Mobile, in which the Spaniards suffered serious loss. Ships that he had ordered arrived at Pensacola, but de Soto determined not to embark until success should have crowned his efforts. He turned back into the interior, into the country of the Chickasaws, marched diagonally over the present State of Mississippi to its northwest corner, and crossed the Mississippi River near the lowest Chickasaw Bluff. From this point the general direction of the Spanish progress was southwest, through what is now Arkansas, past

the site of Little Rock, till at last a river which seems to have been the Washita was reached. Down this stream de Soto and his decimated force floated—two hundred and fifty of his men had succumbed to the hardships and perils of his march—arriving at the junction of the Red with the Mississippi River on Sunday, April 17, 1542. At this point de Soto sickened and died, turning over the command to Luis de Moscoso. Burying their late leader's corpse at night deep in the bosom of the great river, and constructing themselves boats, the survivors of this ill-fated expedition, now reduced to three hundred and seventy-two persons, made the best of their way down the Mississippi to the Gulf, and along its coast, finally reaching the Spanish town near the mouth of the Panuco in Mexico.

Thus no settlement had as yet been made in Florida by the Spanish. The first occupation destined to be permanent was brought about through religious jealousy inspired by the establishment of a French Protestant (Huguenot) colony in the territory. Ribault, a French captain commissioned by Charles IX., was put in command of an expedition by that famous Huguenot, Admiral Coligny, and landed on the coast of Florida, at the mouth of the St. John's, which he called the River of May. This was in 1562. The name Carolina, which that section still bears, was given to a fort at Port Royal, or St. Helena. Ribault returned to France, where civil war was then raging between the Catholics and the Protestants or Huguenots. His colony, waiting for promised aid

and foolishly making no attempt to cultivate the soil, soon languished. Dissensions arose, and an effort was made to return home. Famine having carried off the greater number, the colony came to an end. In 1564 Coligny sent out Laudonnière, who built another fort, also named Carolina, on the River of May. Again misfortunes gathered thickly about the settlers, when Ribault arrived bringing supplies.

But Spain claimed this territory, and Pedro Melendez, a Spanish soldier, was in 1565 sent by Philip II. to conquer it from the French, doubly detested as Protestants. He landed in the harbor and at the mouth of the river, to both of which he gave the name St. Augustine. Melendez lost no time in attacking Fort Carolina, which he surprised, putting the garrison mercilessly to the sword. The destruction of the French colony was soon after avenged by Dominic de Gourgues, who sailed from France to punish the enemies of his country. Having accomplished his purpose by the slaughter of the Spanish garrison he returned home, but the French Protestants made no further effort to colonize Florida.

Spain claimed the land by right of discovery, but, although maintaining the feeble settlement at St. Augustine, did next to nothing after this to explore or civilize this portion of America. The nation that had sent out Columbus was not destined to be permanently the great power of the New World. The hap of first landing upon the Antilles, and also the warm climate and the peaceable nature of the aborigines, led Spain to fix her settlements in

latitudes that were too low for the best health and the greatest energy. Most of the settlers were of a wretched class, criminals and adventurers, and they soon mixed largely with the natives. Spain herself greatly lacked in vigor, partly from national causes, partly from those obscure general causes which even to this day keep Latin Europe in military power and political accomplishments inferior to Teutonic or Germanic Europe.

Moreover, the Spaniards found their first American conquests too easy and the rewards of these too great. This prevented all thought of developing the country through industry, concentrating expectation solely upon waiting fortunes, to be had from the natives by the sword or through forced labor in mines. Their treatment of the aborigines was nothing short of diabolical. Well has it been said: "The Spaniards had sown desolation, havoc, and misery in and around their track. They had depopulated some of the best peopled of the islands and renewed them with victims deported from others. They had inflicted upon hundreds of thousands of the natives all the forms and agonies of fiendish cruelty, driving them to self-starvation and suicide, as a way of mercy and release from an utterly wretched existence. They had come to be viewed by their victims as fiends of hate, malignity, and all dark and cruel desperation and mercilessness in passion. The hell which they denounced upon their victims was shorn of its worst terror by the assurance that these tormentors were not to be there. Las Casas, the noble missionary, the true soldier of the cross, and the

few priests and monks who sympathized with him, in vain protested against these cruelties."

To all these causes we must add the narrow colonial policy of Spain. Imitating Venice and ancient Carthage instead of Greece, she held her dependencies under the strictest servitude to herself as conquered provinces, repressing all political or commercial independence. A similar restrictive policy, indeed, hampered the colonies of other nations, but it was nowhere else so irrational or blighting as in Spanish America.

## CHAPTER III.

### EXPLORATION AND COLONIZATION BY THE FRENCH AND THE ENGLISH

How the French fought for foothold in Florida and were routed by the Spaniards has just been related. So early as 1504, and possibly much earlier, before Cabot or Columbus, French sailors were familiar with the fisheries of Newfoundland. To the Isle of Cape Breton they gave its name in remembrance of their own Brittany. The attention of the French Government was thus early directed toward America, and it at length determined to share in the new discoveries along with the Spanish and the English.

In 1524 Verrazano, a Florentine navigator, was sent by Francis I. on a voyage of discovery to the New World. Sighting the shores of America near the present Wilmington, North Carolina, he explored the coast of New Jersey, touched land near New York Bay, and anchored a few days in the harbor of Newport. In this vicinity he came upon an island, which was probably Block Island. Sailing from here along the coast as far north as Newfoundland, he named this vast territory New France.

In 1534 Cartier, a noted voyager of St. Malo,

coasted along the north of Newfoundland, passed through the Straits of Belle Isle into the water now known as St. Lawrence Gulf, and into the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. Erecting a cross, he took possession of the shores in the name of the king of France.

In the following year he made a second voyage, going up as far as the mouth of a small river which the year before he had named St. John's. He called the waters the Bay of St. Lawrence. Ascending this, he came to a settlement of the natives near a certain hill, which he called *Mont Royal*, now modified into "Montreal." Cartier returned to France in 1536, only a few of his men having survived the winter.

In 1540 Lord Roberval fitted out a fleet, with Cartier as subordinate. Cartier sailed at once—his third voyage—Roberval following the next year. A fort was built near the present site of Quebec. Roberval and Cartier disagreed and returned to France, leaving the real foundation of Quebec to be laid by Champlain, much later.

In 1604 De Monts arrived on the coast of Nova Scotia and erected a fort at the mouth of the St. Croix, New Brunswick. He also made a settlement on the shore of the present harbor of Annapolis, naming it Port Royal, and the country around it Acadia. De Monts is famous largely because under him the Sieur de Champlain, the real father of French colonization in America, began his illustrious career. He had entered the St. Lawrence in 1603. In 1608 he founded Quebec, the first permanent colony of New France. The next year he



explored the lake which perpetuates his name. In 1615 he saw Lake Huron, Le Caron, the Franciscan, preceding him in this only by a few days. Fired with ardor for discovery, Champlain joined the Hurons in an attack upon the Iroquois. This led him into what is now New York State, but whether the Indian camp first attacked by him was on Onondaga or on Canandaigua Lake is still in debate. These were but the beginning of Champlain's travels, by which many other Frenchmen, some as missionaries, some as traders, were inspired to press far out into the then unknown West. We shall resume the narrative in Chapter VII. of the next period. Champlain died at Quebec in 1635.

Turn back now to Columbus's time. England, destined to dominate the continent of North America, was also practically the discoverer of the same. On St. John's day, June 24, 1497, thirteen months and a week before Columbus saw South America, John Cabot, a Venetian in the service of King Henry VII., from the deck of the good ship Matthew, of Bristol, descried land somewhere on the coast either of Labrador or of Nova Scotia. Cabot, of course, supposed this *prima vista* of his to belong to Asia, and expected to reach Cipango next voyage. So late as 1543 Jean Allefonsce, on reaching New England, took it for the border of Tartary. André Thevet, in 1515, in a pretended voyage to Maine, places Cape Breton on the west coast of Asia. This confusion probably explains the tradition of Norumbega as a great city, and of other populous and wealthy cities in the newly found

land. Men transferred ideas of Eastern Asia to this American shore.

The subsequent year Cabot made a second voyage, inspecting the American coast northward till icebergs were met, southward to the vicinity of Albemarle Sound. Possibly in his first expedition, probably in the second, John Cabot was accompanied by his more famous son, Sebastian. For many years after the Cabots, England made little effort to explore the New World. Henry VII. was a Catholic. He therefore submitted to the Pope's bull which gave America to Spain. Henry VIII. had married Catherine of Aragon. He allowed Ferdinand, her father, to employ the skill and daring of Sebastian Cabot in behalf of Spain. It was reserved for the splendid reign of Elizabeth to show what English courage and endurance could accomplish in extending England's power.

Like those before him, Martin Frobisher was in earnest to find the northwest passage, in whose existence all navigators then fully believed. Like Columbus, he vainly sought friends to aid him. At last, after he had waited fifteen years in vain, Dudley, the Earl of Warwick, helped him to an outfit. His little fleet embraced the Gabriel, of thirty-five tons, the Michael of thirty, and a pinnace of ten. As it swept to sea past Greenwich, the Queen waved her hand in token of good-will. Sailing northward near the Shetland Isles, Frobisher passed the southern shore of Greenland and came in sight of Labrador, 1576.

He effected a landing at Hall's Island, at the mouth of the bay now called by his name, but

which he thought to be a strait, his discovery thus strengthening his belief in the possibility of reaching Asia by this westward course. He sailed up the bay as far as Butcher's Island, where five of his men were taken prisoners by the natives. All effort to rescue them was made, but to no purpose. Among the curiosities which he brought home was a piece of stone, or black ore, which gave rise to the belief that gold was to be found in this new country.

A second and larger expedition sailed in 1577. The Queen gave £1,000 and lent the royal ship *Aid*, of two hundred tons. The *Gabriel* and the *Michael* of the former year were again made ready, besides smaller craft. This voyage was to seek gold rather than to discover the north-west passage. The fleet set sail May 27th, and on July 18th arrived off North Foreland, or Hall's Island, so named for the man who had brought away the piece of black earth. Search was made for this metal, supposed to be so valuable, and large quantities were found. The fleet sailed back to England with a heavy cargo of it.

In 1578 a third and the last voyage was made to this region, to which the name *meta incognita* was given. Two large ships were furnished by the Queen, and these were accompanied by thirteen smaller ones.

It was now the purpose to found a colony. The expedition set sail May 31st, going through the English Channel, and reaching the coast of Greenland June 21st. Frobisher and a few of his sailors landed where, perhaps, white men had never trodden before. As he came near the bay he was

driven south by stormy weather, and entered, not knowing his whereabouts, the waters of Hudson's Straits, which he traversed a distance of sixty miles. He succeeded at length in retracing his course, and anchored on the southern shore of Frobisher's Bay, in the Countess of Warwick's Sound. But the desire for gold, the bleak winds, barren shores, and drifting icebergs, all combined to dispel the hopes of making a successful settlement, and the adventurers turned their faces homeward, carrying once more a cargo of ore, which proved, like the first, to be of no value whatever.

Almost three hundred years later Captain Hall, the American explorer, visited the Countess's Island and Sound. Among the Eskimos, from 1860 to 1862, he learned the tradition of Frobisher's visits, which had been preserved and handed down. They knew the number of ships; they spoke of the three times that white men had come; how five of these strangers had been taken captive, and how, after remaining through the winter, they had been allowed to build a boat, and to launch themselves upon the icy seas, never to be heard of more. Captain Hall was shown many relics of Frobisher's voyages, some of which he sent to the Royal Geographical Society of London, a part to the Smithsonian Institute at Washington. The small English house of lime and stone on this island was still standing in good condition, and there was also a trench where they had built their ill-fated boat.

A contemporary of Frobisher, Sir Francis Drake, also entertained the idea of making the northwest passage. While engaged in privateering or piratical

expeditions against the Spanish, Drake landed on the Isthmus of Panama, saw the Pacific for the first time, and determined to enter it by the Straits of Magellan. In 1577 he made his way through the straits, plundered the Spanish along the coast of Chili and Peru, and sailed as far north as the 48th parallel, or Oregon, calling the country New Albion. Steering homeward by the Cape of Good Hope, he arrived at Plymouth, his starting-point, in 1580, having been absent about two years and ten months.

Thomas Cavendish had been with Grenville in the voyage of 1585 to Virginia. Frobisher's attempts inspired him with the ambition of the age. In 1586 he, too, sailed through the Straits of Magellan, burning and plundering Spanish ships, rounded the Cape of Good Hope, and reached Plymouth in 1588, having been gone about two years and fifty days.

These half-piratical attempts against Spain led continually into American waters, till the notion of forming a permanent outpost here as base for such adventures suggested to Sir Humphrey Gilbert the plan, which he failed to realize, of founding an American settlement. Gilbert visited our shores in 1579, and again in 1583, but was lost on his return from the latter voyage.

In 1584 Sir Walter Raleigh sent two captains, Amidas and Barlow, to inspect the coast off what is now North Carolina. They reported so favorably that he began, next year, a colony on Roanoke Island. England was now a Protestant land, and no longer heeded Spanish claims to the trans-

atlantic continent, save so far as actual settlements had been made.

Sir Richard Grenville commanded this expedition, but was to return on seeing the one hundred and eight colonists who accompanied him well established. Queen Elizabeth gave the name VIRGINIA to the new country. Drake, tending homeward from one of his raids on the Spanish coast, in 1586, offered the settlers supplies, but finding them wholly discouraged, he carried them back to England.

Determined to plant an agricultural community, Raleigh next time, 1587, sent men with their families. A daughter to one of these, named Dare, was the first child of English parents born in America. Becoming destitute, the colony despatched its governor home for supplies. He returned to find the settlement deserted, and no tidings as to the fate of the poor colonists have ever been heard from that day to our own. The Jamestown settlers mentioned in the next chapter found among their Indian neighbors a boy whose whitish complexion and wavy hair induced the interesting suspicion that he was descended from some one of these lost colonists of Roanoke.

Thus Sir Walter's enterprise had to be abandoned. In the £40,000 spent upon it his means were exhausted. Besides, England was now at war with Spain, and the entire energies of the nation were in requisition for the overthrow of the Spanish Armada.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE PLANTING OF VIRGINIA

WE have now arrived at the seventeenth century. In 1606 King James I. issued the first English colonial charter. It created a first and a second Virginia Company, the one having its centre in London, and coming to be known as the London Company; the other made up of Bristol, Exeter, and Plymouth men, and gradually taking the title of the Plymouth Company. This latter company, the second, or Plymouth Company, authorized to plant between  $38^{\circ}$  and  $45^{\circ}$  north, effected a settlement in 1607 at the mouth of the Kennebec River. Little came of it but suffering, the colonists, after a severe winter, returning to England.

A colony of one hundred and five planters sent out by the first or London Company, proceeded, also in 1607, to Chesapeake Bay, entering James River, to which they indeed gave this name, and planted upon its banks Jamestown, the first permanent English colony on the continent. This London Company consisted of a council in England, appointed by the king, having the power to name the members of a local council which was to govern the colony, the colonists themselves having no voice.

It is well known that the very earliest population of the Old Dominion was not of the highest, but predominantly idle and thriftless. Vagabonds and homeless children picked up in the streets of London, as well as some convicts, were sent to the colony from England to be indented as servants, permanently, or for a term of years. Persons of the better class, to be sure, came as well, and the quality of the population, on the whole, improved year by year. Settlement here followed a centrifugal tendency, except as this was repressed by fear of the Indians. In 1616 the departments of Virginia were Henrico, up the James above the Appomattox mouth, West and Shirley Hundreds, Jamestown, Kiquoton, and King's Gift on the coast near Cape Charles—a wide reach of territory to be covered by a total population of only three hundred and fifty.

A little exporting was immediately begun. So early as May 20, 1608, Jamestown sent to England a ship laden with iron ore, sassafras, cedar posts, and walnut boards. Another followed on June 2d, with a cargo all of cedar wood. This year or the next, small quantities of pitch, tar, and glass were sent. From 1619 tobacco was so common as to be the currency. About 1650 it was largely exported, a million and a half pounds, on the average, yearly. The figure had risen to twelve million pounds by 1670. At the middle of the century, corn, wheat, rice, hemp, flax, and fifteen varieties of fruit, as well as excellent wine were produced. A wind-mill was set up about 1620, the first in America. It stood at Falling Creek on the James River. The pioneer iron works on



the continent were in this colony, hailing from about the date last named. Community of property prevailed at Jamestown in all the earliest years, as it did at Plymouth. After the event noted by John Rolfe: "about the last of August [1619] came in a Dutch man of warre that sold us twenty Negars," slavery was a continual and increasing curse, as is attested by the laws concerning slaves. It encouraged indolence and savagery of habit and nature. Virginian slaves, however, were better treated than those farther south. They were tolerably clothed, fed, and housed.

There was in Virginia little of that healthful social and political contact which did so much to develop civilization at the North. Of town life there was practically nothing. Even so late as 1716 Jamestown had only a sorry half-dozen structures, two of which were church and court-house. Fifteen years later Fredericksburg had, besides the manor house of Colonel Willis and its belongings, only a store, a tailor shop, a blacksmith shop, a tavern or "ordinary," and a coffee-house. Richmond and Petersburg still existed only on paper, and if we come down to the middle of the eighteenth century, Williamsburg, the capital of the province, was nothing but a straggling village of two hundred houses, without a single paved street. Only the College and the governor's "palace" were of brick. The county-seats were mostly mere glades in the woods containing each its court-house, prison, whipping-post, pillory, and ducking-stool, besides the wretched tavern where court and attendants put up, and possibly a church.

Hardships and dissensions marked the whole early history of this infant state. At one time only forty settlers remained alive, at another meal and water were the sole diet. Hoping for instant riches in gold, poor gentlemen and vagabonds had come, too much to the exclusion of mechanics and laborers. For relief from the turbulence and external dangers of this period, the colony owed much to Captain John Smith, who, after all allowance for his boasting, certainly displayed great courage and energy in emergencies. He, too, it was who did most to explore the country up the James and upon Chesapeake Bay.

A new charter was granted in 1609, the council in England being now appointed by the stockholders instead of the king, and the governor of the colony being named by this council. Lord Delaware was made Governor and Captain-General of Virginia, and many more colonists sent out. By a wreck of two of the vessels there was delay in the arrival of the newly chosen officers. Smith, then Percy, meantime continued to exercise authority. This, again, was a critical period. Indians were troublesome. Tillage having been neglected from the first, provisions became exhausted, and a crisis long referred to as "the starving time" ensued. The colony had actually abandoned Jamestown and shipped for England, when met in James River by Lord Delaware, coming with relief. They at once returned, and an era of hope dawned. This was in June, 1610. One hundred and fifty new settlers accompanied Delaware. Planting was vigorously prosecuted, the Indians placated, and

still further accessions of people and cattle secured from England.

Delaware's brief, mild sway was always a benediction, in pleasing contrast with the severities of Dale and Argall, who successively governed after his departure. Under Dale, death was the penalty for slaughtering cattle, even one's own, except with the governor's leave, also of exporting goods without permission. A baker giving short weight was to lose his ears, and on second repetition to suffer death. A laundress purloining linen was to be flogged. Martial law alone prevailed; even capital punishment was ordained without jury. Such arbitrary rule was perhaps necessary, so lawless were the mass of the population. It at any rate had the excellent effect of rousing the Virginians to political thought and to the assertion of their rights. In 1612 a change took place in the Company's methods of governing its colony. The superior council was abolished, its authority transferred to the corporation as a whole, which met as an assembly to elect officers and enact laws for the colony. The government thus became more democratic in form and spirit.

The year 1614 was distinguished by the marriage of Pocahontas, daughter of the native chief, Powhatan, to the English colonist Rolfe. With him she visited England, dying there a few years later. The alliance secured the valuable friendship of Powhatan and his subjects—only till Powhatan's death, however. Thenceforth savage hostilities occurred at frequent intervals. In 1622 they were peculiarly severe, over three hundred

settlers losing their lives through them. Another outbreak took place about 1650, this time more quickly suppressed. We shall see in a later chapter how Bacon's Rebellion was occasioned by Indian troubles.

As James I. broke with Parliament, a majority of the Virginia shareholders proved Liberals, and they wrought with signal purpose and effect to realize their ideas in their colony. To this political complexion of the Virginia Company not only Virginia itself but, in a way, all America is indebted for a start toward free institutions. During the governorship of George Yeardley, was summoned an assembly of burgesses, consisting of two representatives, elected by the inhabitants, from each of the eleven boroughs or districts which the colony had by this time come to embrace. It met on June 30, 1619, the earliest legislative body in the New World. This was the dawn of another new era in the colony's history.

In 1622 arrived Sir Thomas Wyatt, bringing a written constitution from the Company, which confirmed to the colony representative government and trial by jury. The assembly was given authority to make laws, subject only to the Governor's veto. This enlargement of political rights was due to the growth of the sentiment of popular liberty in England. In the meetings of the London Company debates were frequent and spirited between the court faction and the supporters of the political rights of the colonists. James I., dissatisfied with the authority which he had himself granted, appointed a commission to inquire into the Com-

pany's management, and also into the circumstances of the colony. A change was recommended, the courts decided as the king wished, and the Company was dissolved. The colony, while still allowed to govern itself by means of its popular assembly, was thus brought directly under the supervision of the Crown. Charles I., coming to the throne in 1625, gave heed to the affairs of the colony only so far as necessary to secure for himself the profits of the tobacco trade. It was doubtless owing to his indifference that the colony continued to enjoy civil freedom. He again appointed Yeardley Governor, a choice agreeable to the people; and in 1628, by asking that the assembly be called in order to vote him a monopoly of the coveted trade, he explicitly recognized the legitimacy and authority of that body.

Yeardley was succeeded by Harvey, who rendered himself unpopular by defending in all land disputes the claims arising under royal grant against those based upon occupancy. Difficulties of this sort pervaded all colonial history.

In 1639 Wyatt held the office, succeeded in 1642 by Berkeley, during whose administration the colony attained its highest prosperity. Virginians now possessed constitutional rights and privileges in even a higher degree than Englishmen in the northern colonies. The colonists were most loyal to the king, and were let alone. They were also attached to the Church of England, ever manifesting toward those of a different faith the spirit of intolerance characteristic of the age.

During the civil war in England, Virginia, of

course, sided with the king. When Cromwell had assumed the reins of government he sent an expedition to require the submission of the colony. An agreement was made by which the authority of Parliament was acknowledged, while the colony in return was left unmolested in the management of its own affairs.

## CHAPTER V.

### PILGRIM AND PURITAN AT THE NORTH

THE Pilgrims who settled New England were Independents, peculiar in their ecclesiastical tenet that the single congregation of godly persons, however few or humble, regularly organized for Christ's work, is of right, by divine appointment, the highest ecclesiastical authority on earth. A church of this order existed in London by 1568; another, possibly more than one, the "Brownists," by 1580. Barrowe and Greenwood began a third in 1588, which, its founders being executed, went exiled to Amsterdam in 1593, subsequently uniting with the Presbyterians there. These churches, though independent, were not strictly democratic, like those next to be named.

Soon after 1600 John Smyth gathered a church at Gainsborough in Lincolnshire, England, which persecution likewise drove to Amsterdam. Here Smyth seceded and founded a Baptist church, which, returning to London in 1611 or 1612, became the first church of its kind known to have existed in England. From Smyth's church at Gainsborough sprang one at Scrooby, in Nottinghamshire, and this, too, exiled like its parent, crossed to Holland, finding home in Leyden in 1607 and

1608. Of this church John Robinson was pastor, and from its bosom came the Plymouth Colony to New England.

This little band set out for America with a patent from the Virginia Company, according to James I.'s charter of 1606, but actually began here as labor-share holders in a sub-corporation of a new organization, the Plymouth Company, chartered in 1620. Launching in the *Mayflower* from Plymouth, where they had paused in their way hither from Holland, they arrived off the coast of Cape Cod in 1620, December 11th, Old Style, December 21st New Style, and began a settlement, to which they gave the name Plymouth. Before landing they had formed themselves into a political body, a government of the people with "just and equal laws."

They based their civil authority upon this *Mayflower* compact, practically ignoring England. Carver was the first governor, Bradford the second. The colony was named Plymouth in memory of hospitalities which its members had received at Plymouth, England, the name having no connection with the "Plymouth" of the Plymouth Company. The members of the Plymouth Company had none but a mercantile interest in the adventure, merely fitting out the colonists and bearing the expense of the passage for all but the first. On the other hand, the stock was not all retained in England. Shares were allotted to the Pilgrims as well, one to each emigrant with or without means, and one for every £10 invested.

Plymouth early made a treaty with Massasoit,



the chief of the neighboring Wampanoags, the peace lasting with benign effects to both parties for fifty years, or till the outbreak of Philip's War, discussed in a later chapter. The first winter in Plymouth was one of dreadful hardships, of famine, disease and death, which spring relieved but in part. Yet Plymouth grew, surely if slowly. It acquired rights on the Kennebec, on the Connecticut, at Cape Ann. It was at first a pure democracy, its laws all made in mass-meetings of the entire body of male inhabitants; nor was it till 1639 that increase of numbers forced resort to the principle of representation. In 1643 the population was about three thousand.

Between 1620 and 1630 there were isolated settlers along the whole New England coast. White, a minister from Dorchester, England, founded a colony near Cape Ann, which removed to Salem in 1626. The Plymouth Company granted them a patent, which Endicott, in charge of more emigrants, brought over in 1628. It gave title to all land between the Merrimac and Charles Rivers, also to all within three miles beyond each. These men formed the nucleus of the colony to which in 1629 Charles I. granted a royal charter, styling the proprietors "the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England." Boston was made the capital. Soon more emigrants came, and Charlestown was settled.

It was a momentous step when the government of this colony was transferred to New England. Winthrop was chosen governor, others of the Company elected to minor offices, and they, with no fewer

than one thousand new colonists, sailed for this side the Atlantic. In Massachusetts, therefore, a trading company did not *beget*, as elsewhere, but literally *became* a political state. Many of the Massachusetts men, in contrast with those of Plymouth, had enjoyed high consideration at home. Yet democracy prevailed here too. The Governor and his eighteen assistants were chosen by the freemen, and were both legislature and court. As population increased and scattered in towns, these chose deputies to represent them, and a lower house element was added to the General Court, though assistants and deputies did not sit separately till 1644. At this time Massachusetts had a population of about 15,000. To all New England 21,200 emigrants came between 1628 and 1643, the total white population at the latter date being about 24,000.

So early as 1631 this colony decreed to admit none as freemen who were not also church members. Thus Church and State were made one, the government a theocracy. The Massachusetts settlers, though in many things less extreme than the Pilgrims, were decided Puritans, sincere but formal, precise, narrow, and very superstitious. They did not, however, on coming hither, affect or wish to separate from the Church of England, earnestly as they deprecated retaining the sign of the cross in baptism, the surplice, marriage with ring, and kneeling at communion. Yet soon they in effect became Separatists as well as Puritans, building independent churches, like those at Plymouth, and repudiating episcopacy utterly.

Much as these Puritans professed and tried to exalt reason in certain matters, in civil and religious affairs, where they took the Old Testament as affording literal and minute directions for all sorts of human actions for all time, they could allow little liberty of opinion. This was apparent when into this theocratic state came Roger Williams, afterward the founder of Rhode Island. Born in Cornwall, England, about 1600, of good family, he was placed by his patron, Coke, at the Charter House School. From there he went to Pembroke College, Cambridge. In 1631 he arrived in Boston. Somewhat finical in his political, moral, and religious ideas, he found it impossible, having separated from the Church of England, in which he had been reared, to harmonize here with those still favoring that communion. At Salem he was invited by a little company of separatists to become their teacher. His views soon offended the authorities. He declared that the king's patent could confer no title to lands possessed by Indians. He denied the right of magistrates to punish heresy, or to enforce attendance upon religious services. "The magistrate's power," he said, "extends only to the bodies, goods, and outward state of men."

Alarmed at his bold utterances, the General Court of Massachusetts, September 2, 1635, decreed his banishment for "new and dangerous opinions, against the authority of magistrates." His fate was not, therefore, merely because of his religious views. The exile sought refuge at Seekonk, but this being within the Plymouth jurisdiction, he, on Governor Winslow's admonition,

moved farther into the wilderness, settling at Providence. He purchased land of the natives, and, joined by others, set up a pure democracy, instituting as a part thereof the "lively experiment" for which ages had waited, of perfect liberty in matters of religious belief. Not for the first time in history, but more clearly, earnestly, and consistently than it had ever been done before, he maintained for every man the right of absolute freedom in matters of conscience, for all forms of faith equal toleration.

Some friends of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson established a colony on Aquidneck, the Indian name for Rhode Island. Williams went to England and secured from Parliament a patent which united that plantation with his in one government. Charles II.'s charter of 1663 added Warwick to the first two settlements, renewing and enlarging the patent, and giving freest scope for government according to Williams's ideas. Mrs. Hutchinson, a woman of rare intellect and eloquence, who maintained the right of private judgment and pretended to an infallible inner light of revelation, was, like Williams, a victim of Puritan intolerance. She and her followers were banished, and some of them, returning, put to death, 1659-60. She came to Providence, then went to Aquidneck, where her husband died in 1642. She next settled near Hurl Gate, within the Dutch limits, where herself and almost her entire family were butchered by the Indians in 1643.

In 1633 the Dutch erected a fort where Hartford now is, but some English emigrants from

Plymouth Colony, in defiance of a threatened cannonade, sailed past and built a trading-house at Windsor, where, joined by colonists, from about Boston, they soon effected a settlement. Wethersfield and Hartford were presently founded. In 1630 the Plymouth Company had granted Connecticut to the Earl of Warwick, who turned it over to Lord Brooke, Lord Say-and-Seal, and others. Winthrop the Younger, son of Governor Winthrop, of Massachusetts, commissioned by these last, built a fort at Saybrook. Till the expiration of his commission the towns immediately upon the Connecticut were under the government of Massachusetts. Their population in 1643 was three thousand. A convention of these towns met at Hartford, January 14, 1639, and formed a constitution, like that of Massachusetts Bay, thoroughly republican in nature. Connecticut breathed a freer spirit than either Massachusetts or New Haven, being in this respect the peer of Plymouth. At Hartford Roger Williams was always welcome.

Meantime, in 1638, having touched at Boston the year before, Davenport, Eaton, and others from London began planting at New Haven. The Bible was adopted as their guide in both civil and religious affairs, and a government organized in which only church members could vote or be elected to the General Court. The colony flourished, branching out into several towns. In 1643 it numbered twenty-five hundred inhabitants.

As early as 1622, Mason and Gorges were granted land partly in what is now Maine, partly in what is now New Hampshire ; and in 1623 Dover


and Portsmouth were settled. Wheelwright, a brother-in-law of Mrs. Hutchinson, with others, purchased of the natives the southeast part of New Hampshire, between the Merrimac and the Piscataqua, and in 1638 Exeter was founded. In the same year with Wheelwright's purchase, Mason obtained from the council of the Plymouth Company a patent to this same section, and the tract was called New Hampshire. These conflicting claims paved the way for future controversies and lawsuits. The settlers here were not Puritans, nor were they obliged to be church members in order to be deputies or freemen.

The settlement of Maine goes back to 1626, when the Plymouth Company granted lands there both to Alexander and to Gorges. In 1639 Gorges secured a royal charter to re-enforce his claim. Large freedom, civil and religious, was allowed. For many years the Maine settlements were small and scattered, made up mostly of such as came to hunt and fish for a season only.

From 1643 to 1684 Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven formed a confederation under the style of the United Colonies of New England. Maine, Providence, and Rhode Island sought membership, but were refused as being civilly and religiously out of harmony with the colonies named. Connecticut, offensive to the Dutch, and exposed to hostilities from them, was the most earnest for the union, while at the same time the most conservative as to its form. It was a loose league, leaving each colony independent save as to war and peace, Indian affairs, alliances

and boundaries. Questions pertaining to these were to be settled by a commission of two delegates from each of the four colonies, meeting yearly, voting man by man, six out of the eight votes being necessary to bind.

The confederacy settled a boundary dispute between New Haven and New Netherland in 1650. It received and disbursed moneys, amounting some years to £600, for the propagation of the gospel in New England, sent over by the society which Parliament incorporated for that purpose in 1649. It was also of more or less service in securing united action against the savages in Philip's War. The union was, however, of little immediate service, useful rather as an example for the far future. Its failure was due partly to the distance of the colonies apart, and to the strength of the instinct for local self-government, a distinguishing political trait of New England till our day. Its main weakness, however, was the overbearing power and manner of Massachusetts, especially after her assumption of Maine in 1652. In 1653 the Plymouth, New Haven, and Connecticut commissioners earnestly wished war with New Netherland, but Massachusetts proudly forbade—a plain violation of the articles. After this there was not much heart in the alliance. The last meeting of the commissioners occurred at Hartford, September 5, 1684.



## CHAPTER VI.

### BALTIMORE AND HIS MARYLAND

THE very year that witnessed the landing of the Pilgrims records the beginning of another attempt to colonize the New World. While Secretary of State, having been appointed in 1619, Sir George Calvert, a member of the Virginia Company from 1609 until its dissolution in 1624, determined to plant a colony for himself. In the memorable year 1620 he bought of Lord Vaughan the patent to the southeastern peninsula of Newfoundland, the next he sent colonists thither with a generous supply of money for their support. In 1623 King James gave him a patent, making him proprietary of this region. In 1625 Calvert boldly declared himself a Catholic, and resigned his office of Secretary. Spite of this he was soon afterwards ennobled, and his new title of Lord Baltimore is the name by which he is best known. Visiting his little settlement in 1627 he quickly came to the conclusion that the severity of the climate would make its failure certain. He therefore gave up this enterprise, but determined to repeat the attempt on the more favorable soil of Virginia. Confident of the good-will of Charles I., to whom he had written for a grant of land there, he did not await a



reply, but sailed for Virginia, where he arrived in 1629. In 1632 the king issued a patent granting to Baltimore and his heirs a territory north and east of the Potomac, comprising what we now call Maryland, all Delaware, and a part of Pennsylvania. The name Maryland was given it by the king in honor of his queen, Henrietta Maria. But before this charter had received royal signature Lord Baltimore had breathed his last, and his son Cecil succeeded to his honors and possessions.

The Maryland charter made the proprietary the absolute lord of the soil. He was merely to acknowledge fealty by the delivery of two Indian arrows yearly to the king at Windsor. He could make laws with the consent of the citizens, declare war or peace, appoint officers of government; in fact in most respects he had regal power. The colonists were, however, to remain English subjects, with all the privileges of such. If they were not represented in Parliament, neither were they taxed by the crown. If the proprietary made laws for them, these must not be contrary to the laws of England. And they were to enjoy freedom of trade, not only with England but with foreign countries.

This charter, as will be readily seen, could not please the Virginians, since the entire territory conveyed by it was part of the grant of 1609 to the London Company for Virginia. But as this and subsequent charters had been annulled in 1624, the new colony was held by the Privy Council to have the law on its side, and Lord Baltimore was left to make his preparations undisturbed. He fitted

out two vessels, the Ark and the Dove, and sent them on their voyage of colonization. They went by the way of the West Indies, arriving off Point Comfort in 1634. Sailing up the Potomac, they landed on the island of St. Clement's, and took formal possession of their new home. Calvert explored a river, now called the St. Mary's, a tributary of the Potomac, and being pleased with the spot began a settlement. He gained the friendship of the natives by purchasing the land and by treating them justly and humanely.

The proprietary was a Catholic, yet, whether or not by an agreement between him and the king, as Gardiner supposes, did not use either his influence or his authority to distress adherents of the Church of England. The two creeds stood practically upon an equality. But if religious troubles were avoided, difficulties of another sort were not slow in arising. About the year 1631, Clayborne, who had been secretary of the Virginia colony, had chosen Kent Island in Chesapeake Bay as a station for trading with the Indians. This post was in the very midst of Maryland, and Calvert notified Clayborne that he should consider it a part of that province. Clayborne at once showed himself a bitter enemy. The Indians became suspicious and unfriendly, Clayborne, so it was believed, being the instigator of this temper. An armed vessel was sent out, with orders from Clayborne to seize ships of the St. Mary's settlement. A fight took place, Clayborne fleeing to Virginia. Calvert demanded that he should be given up. This was refused and in 1637 he went to England. A com-

mittee of the Privy Council decided that Kent Island belonged to Maryland.

In 1635 the first Maryland assembly met, consisting of the freemen of the colony and the Governor, Leonard Calvert, the proprietary's brother, who was presiding officer. Lord Baltimore repudiated its acts, on the ground that they were not proposed by him, as the charter directed. The assembly which gathered in 1638 retaliated, rejecting the laws brought forward by the proprietary.

For a time the colony was without laws except the common law of England. But Baltimore was too wise and conciliatory to allow such a state of affairs to continue. He gave authority to the Governor to assent to the acts of the assembly, which he himself might or might not confirm. Accordingly in 1639 the assembly met and passed various acts, mostly relating to civil affairs. One, however, was specially noteworthy, as giving to the "Holy Church" "her rights and liberties," meaning by this the Church of Rome, for, as Gardiner says, the title was never applied to the Church of England. It was at the same time expressly enacted that all the Christian inhabitants should be in the enjoyment of every right and privilege as free as the natural-born subjects of England. If Roger Williams was the first to proclaim absolute religious liberty, Lord Baltimore was hardly behind him in putting this into practice. As has been neatly said, "The Ark and the Dove were names of happy omen: the one saved from the general wreck the germs of political liberty, and the other bore the olive-branch of religious peace."

During the civil war in England the affairs of Maryland were in a very disturbed condition. Clayborne, Maryland's evil genius, seized the opportunity to foment an insurrection, possessed himself once more of Kent Island, and compelled the governor to flee to Virginia. Returning in 1646, Calvert was fortunate enough to recover the reins of government, but the following year witnessed the close of his administration and his short though useful and eventful life. Few men intrusted with almost absolute authority have exercised it with so much firmness and at the same time with so much ability, discretion, and uprightness.

His successor, Greene, a Catholic, was not likely to find favor with the Puritan Parliament of England, and Baltimore, in 1648, to conciliate the ruling powers and to refute the charge that Maryland was only a retreat for Romanists, removed the governor and appointed instead one who was a Protestant and a firm supporter of Parliament. The council was also changed so as to place the Catholics in the minority. The oath of the new governor restrained him from molesting any person, especially if of the Roman Catholic persuasion, on account of religious profession. The way was thus opened for the Act of Toleration passed in 1649. This law, after specifying certain speeches against the Trinity, the Virgin, or the saints as punishable offences, declared that equal privileges should be enjoyed by Christians of all creeds. Whatever the motives of Baltimore, his policy was certainly wise and commendable.

A new and troublesome element was now introduced into the colony. Some Puritans who had not been tolerated among the staunch Church-of-England inhabitants of Virginia were invited by Governor Stone to Maryland. Their home here, which they named Providence, is now known as Annapolis. The new-comers objected to the oath of fidelity, refused to send burgesses to the assembly, and were ready to overthrow the government whose protection they were enjoying. Opportunity soon offered. Parliament had already in 1652 brought Virginia to submission. Maryland was now accused of disloyalty, and when we notice among the commissioners appointed by the Council of State, the name of Clayborne, it is not difficult to understand who was the author of this charge. The governor was removed, but being popular and not averse to compromise, was quickly restored. Then came the accession of Cromwell to power as Protector of England. Parliament was dissolved. The authority of its commissioners of course ceased. Baltimore seized this opportunity to regain his position as proprietary. He bade Stone to require the oath of fidelity to the proprietary from those who occupied lands, and to issue all writs in his name. He maintained that the province now stood in the same relations to the Protectorate which it had borne to the royalist government of Charles I.

So thought Cromwell, but not so Clayborne or the Maryland Puritans. They deposed Stone, and put in power Fuller, who was in sympathy with their designs. There resulted a reversal of the acts

of former assemblies, and legislation hostile to the Catholics. The new assembly, from which Catholics were carefully excluded by disfranchisement, at once repealed the Act of Toleration. Protection was withdrawn from those who professed the popish religion, and they were forbidden the exercise of that faith in the province. Severe penalties were threatened against "prelacy" and "licentiousness," thus restricting the benefits of their "Act concerning Religion" to the Puritan element now in power. The authority of the proprietary himself was disputed, and colonists were invited to take lands without his knowledge or consent.

Baltimore adopted vigorous measures. By his orders Stone made a forcible attempt to regain control of the province, but was defeated at Providence and taken prisoner. His life was spared, but four of his men were condemned and executed. Baltimore again invoked the powerful intervention of Cromwell, and again were the enemies of Maryland sternly rebuked for their interference in the affairs of that province, and told in plain language to leave matters as they had found them. In 1656, after an inquiry by the Commissioners of Trade, the claims of Baltimore were admitted to be just, and he promptly sent his brother Philip to be a member of the council and secretary of the province. The legislation of the usurping Puritans was set aside, religious toleration once more had full sway, and a general pardon was proclaimed to those who had taken part in the late disturbances.

In the meantime, Fendall, who had been appointed governor by Baltimore, plotted to make

himself independent of his master, and, with the connivance of the assembly, proceeded to usurp the authority which was lawfully vested in the proprietary. But the attempt was a miserable failure. Philip Calvert was immediately made governor by the now all-powerful proprietary, who had the favor and support of Charles II., just coming to the throne. Peace and prosperity came back to the colony so sorely and frequently vexed by civil dissensions. The laws were just and liberal, encouraging the advent of settlers of whatever creed, while the rule of the Calverts was wise and benign, such as to merit the respect and admiration of posterity. In 1643 Virginia and Maryland together had less than twenty thousand inhabitants. In 1660 Maryland alone, according to Fuller, had eight thousand. Chalmers thinks there were no fewer than 12,000 at this date.

## CHAPTER VII.

### NEW NETHERLAND

WHILE the French explorer, Champlain, was sailing along the shores of the lake which bears his name, another equally adventurous spirit, Henry Hudson, was on his way to the western world. Hoping to open a passage to India by a voyage to the north, Hudson, an English navigator, offered in 1609 to sail under the authority of the Dutch East India Company. Driven back by ice and fog from a northeast course, he turned northwest. Searching up and down near the parallel of  $40^{\circ}$ , he entered the mouth of the great river which perpetuates his name. He found the country inviting to the eye, and occupied by natives friendly in disposition. The subsequent career of this bold mariner has a mournful interest. He never returned to Holland, but, touching at Dartmouth, was restrained by the English authorities, and forbidden longer to employ his skill and experience for the benefit of the Dutch. Again entering the English service and sent once more to discover the northwest passage, he sailed into the waters of the bay which still bears his name, where cold and hunger transformed the silent discontent of his crew into open mutiny, and they left the fear-



less navigator to perish amid the icebergs of the frozen north.

Hudson had sent to Holland a report of the Great River and the country bordering it, rich in fur-bearing animals, and it had excited eager interest. Private individuals sent expeditions thither and carried on a profitable trade with the natives. A few Dutch were here when, in 1613, Captain Argall sailed from Virginia against the French at Port Royal, Acadia, now Annapolis in Nova Scotia, who were encroaching upon the English possessions on the coast of Maine. He compelled them to surrender. On his return, he visited the Dutch traders of Manhattan Island, and forced them also, as it had been discovered by Cabot in 1497, to acknowledge the sovereignty of England over this entire region.

It was in 1614 that the Dutch States-General, in the charter given to a company of merchants, named the Hudson Valley New Netherland. To facilitate trade this company made a treaty with the Five Nations and subordinate tribes, memorable as the first compact formed between the whites and the savages. In it the Indians were regarded as possessing equal rights and privileges with their white brethren. The treaty was renewed in 1645 and continued in force till the English occupation, 1664. In 1618, the charter of the New Netherland Company having expired, the Dutch West India Company was offered a limited incorporation, but it was not until 1621 that it received its charter, and it was two years later that it was completely organized and approved by the States-General.

By this company were sent out Mey, as Director, to the Delaware or South River, and Tienpont to the Hudson or North River. Four miles below Philadelphia Fort Nassau was erected, and where Albany now stands was begun the trading-post called Fort Orange.

In 1626 Tienpont's successor, Peter Minuit, a German, born at Wesel, was appointed Director-General of New Netherland. He bought of the Indians, for the sum of twenty-four dollars, the entire island of Manhattan, and a fort called New Amsterdam was built. The State of New York dates its beginning from this transaction.

By their usually honest dealing with the natives the Dutch settlers gained the friendship of the Five Nations, whose good-will was partly on this account transferred to the English colonists later. The Dutch were not only friendly to the red men, but tried to open social and commercial relations with the Plymouth colonists as well. Governor Bradford replied, mildly urging the Dutch to "clear their title" to a territory which the English claimed by right of discovery.

The present State of Delaware soon became the scene of attempts at settlement. De Vries began, in 1632, a colony on the banks of the Delaware, but it was quickly laid waste by the savages, who had been needlessly provoked by the insolence of the commander left in charge of the colony. In 1633 Minuit was succeeded by Van Twiller, and a fort was erected at Hartford, though the English claimed this country as theirs. Emigrants from the Plymouth colony began the settlement of Wind-

sor, in spite of the protests of the Dutch. Long Island was invaded by enterprising New Englanders, regardless of the claim of New Netherland thereto.


This "irrepressible conflict" between two races was by no means abated by the introduction of a third. As early as 1626, Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden and the hero of the Thirty Years' War, had entertained the idea of establishing colonies in America, and in pursuance of that object had encouraged the formation of a company, not only for trading purposes but also to secure a refuge for the "oppressed of all Christendom." To Usselinx, an Antwerp merchant, the originator of the Dutch West India Company, belongs the honor of first suggesting to the king this enterprise. The glorious death of Gustavus on the victorious field of Lützen in 1632 deferred the execution of a purpose which had not been forgotten even in the midst of that long and arduous campaign. But a few days before he fell the Protestant hero had spoken of the colonial prospect as "the jewel of his kingdom."

In 1638 Minuit, who had already figured as governor of New Netherland, having offered his services to Sweden, was intrusted with the leadership of the first Swedish colony to America. After a few days' stay at Jamestown the new-comers finally reached their wished-for destination on the west shore of the Delaware Bay and River. Proceeding up the latter, one of their first acts was to build a fort on a little stream about two miles from its junction with the Delaware, which they named Fort Christina, in honor of the young queen of Sweden. Near this spot stands the present city

of Wilmington. The country from Cape Henlopen to the falls at Trenton received the title of New Sweden.

It was in this very year that Kieft came to supersede Van Twiller, who had given just cause for complaint by his eagerness to enrich himself at the expense of the West India Company. During the administration of Kieft occurred the long and doubtful conflict with the natives detailed in the succeeding chapter. Arbitrary and exacting, he drove the Indians to extremities, and involved the Dutch settlements in a war which for a time threatened their destruction. Not till 1645 was peace re-established, and in 1647 the unpopular governor was recalled. In 1647 not more than three hundred fighting men remained in the whole province. Its total population was between fifteen hundred and two thousand. In 1652 New Amsterdam had a population of seven or eight hundred. In 1664 Stuyvesant put the number in the province at ten thousand, about fifteen hundred of whom were in New Amsterdam.

The next governor, Stuyvesant, was the last and much the ablest ruler among those who directed the destinies of New Netherland. His administration embraced a period of seventeen years, during which he renewed the former friendly relations with the savages, made a treaty with New England, giving up pretensions to Connecticut as well as relinquishing the east end of Long Island, and compelled the Swedes, in 1655, to acknowledge the Dutch supremacy. It was while he was absent on his expedition against the Swedes, leaving New



**EUROPEAN PROVINCES  
1655.**

SCALE OF MILES  
0 50 100 150 200 250 300 350

- EXPLANATION OF COLORS.
- French
  - English
  - Dutch
  - Swedish
  - Spanish

90 Longitude West 85 from Greenwich 80 75



Amsterdam unprotected, that the river Indians, watchful of their opportunity, invaded and laid waste the surrounding country. In 1663 the savages attacked the village on the Esopus, now Kingston, and almost destroyed it. It was not until the energetic governor made a vigorous campaign against the Esopus tribe, whom he completely subdued, that peace was established on a firm footing.

But the Dutch sway in their little part of the New World was about to end. The English had never given over their claim to the country by virtue of their first discovery of the North American continent. The New Netherlanders, tired of arbitrary rule, sighed for the larger freedom of their New England neighbors. Therefore, when in 1664 Charles II. granted to his brother, the Duke of York, the territory which the Dutch were occupying, and sent a fleet to demand its submission, the English invader was welcomed. Almost the only resistance came from the stout-hearted governor, who could hardly be dissuaded from fighting the English single-handed, and who signed the agreement to surrender only when his magistrates had, in spite of him, agreed to the proposed terms. But the founders of the Empire State have left an indelible impress upon the Union, which their descendants have helped to strengthen and perpetuate. They were honest, thrifty, devout, tolerant of the opinions of others. As Holland sheltered the English Puritans from ecclesiastical intolerance, so New Netherland welcomed within her borders the victims of New England bigotry and narrowness.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE FIRST INDIAN WARS

TROUBLES between the Indians and the whites arose so early as 1636. John Oldham was murdered on Block Island by a party of Pequot Indians. Vane of Massachusetts sent Endicott to inflict punishment. The Pequots in turn attacked the fort at Saybrook, and in 1637 threatened Wethersfield. They were planning a union with the Narragansetts for the destruction of the English, when Roger Williams informed the Massachusetts colony of their designs and, at the urgent request of the governor and council, hastened to the chief of the Narragansetts and dissuaded him from entering into the alliance.

The moment was critical. Captain Mason with about ninety English and seventy Mohegans, under their sachem, Uncas (a sub-chief, who with his district, Mohegan, had rebelled against the Pequot sachem, Sassacus) was sent from Hartford down the Connecticut River. Entering the Sound, he sailed past the mouth of the Thames and anchored in Narragansett Bay, at the foot of Tower Hill, near Point Judith. He knew that keen-eyed scouts from the Pequot stronghold on the west bank of the Mystic River, near Groton, had, as his three little ships



skirted the shore, been watching him, to give warning of his approach. He therefore resolved to come upon the enemy from an unlooked-for quarter. This plan was directly contrary to his instructions, which required him to land at the mouth of the Thames and attack the fort from the west side. He hoped, marching westward across the country, to take the enemy by surprise on their unprotected rear, while the Indians, trusting in the strength of their fort, as it fronted the west, should believe themselves secure.

Thirteen men had been sent back to the Thames with the vessels. Two hundred Narragansetts had joined the expedition, though their sachem, Miantinomoh, thought the English too weak to fight the dreaded Pequots. Mason's enterprise was admirably planned, and he was as fortunate as he was bold and skilful. He divided his men into two parties. One, led by Underhill, climbed the steep ascent on the south side of the Indian village; the other, directed by Mason himself, mounted the northern slope. The garrison was buried in slumber, made more profound by carousals the preceding night. One Indian was heard to cry out "Englishmen" before the volley of musketry from the attacking force told that the white enemy had come. Mason entered a wigwam and fought, as did the others, hand-to-hand with the now awakened and desperate foe. Coming out with a firebrand and exclaiming "we must burn them," he set fire to the wigwam. The flames were quickly carried through the fort by the northeast wind. Underhill from his side applied powder. So rap-

idly did the flames spread that the English had difficulty in making good their escape, while the Pequots who escaped the sword were doomed to perish by fire. In an hour's time from four hundred to six hundred had fallen, more than half of them women and children. Of the Englishmen two were killed and about twenty wounded. In this dreadful slaughter the Narragansetts had little share, for they had shown such fear that Mason had said to Uncas, "Tell them not to fly, but stand at what distance they please and see whether Englishmen will now fight or not."

With the approach of day three hundred Pequots advanced from a second fort intending to fight, but they were struck with horror at the sight of their dead fellow-warriors. Keeping the enemy at bay, the English marched to the vessels, which had arrived at Pequot Harbor, and, placing the wounded on board, continued their march to Saybrook. The remnant of the Pequots sought to escape from the country, moving westward along the Sound. Captain Stoughton, sent with one hundred and twenty Massachusetts men, was guided by the Narragansetts to a swamp in which a little band of those hostile savages had hidden. The men were slain, offering little resistance. The women and children were divided among the Indian allies or sold into slavery by the colonists of Massachusetts Bay.

Mason and Stoughton together sailed from Saybrook along the shore, while Uncas with his men tracked the fugitives by land. At Guilford a Pequot sachem was entrapped, shot, and his head thrust into the crotch of an oak-tree near the har-

bor, giving the place the name of Sachem's Head. Near the town of Fairfield a last stand was made by the hunted redskins, in a swamp, to which the English were guided by a renegade Pequot. The tribe with whom the Pequots had taken shelter, also the women and children, were allowed to give themselves up. The men were shot down or broke through and escaped. The wife of Mononotto fell into the hands of the English. This Indian squaw had once shown kindness to two captive girls, and by Winthrop's orders she was kindly treated in return. The Pequots, once so powerful, were well-nigh exterminated. Those taken prisoners were spared only to be held in bondage, Mononotto's wife with the rest. Some were absorbed by the Narragansetts, others by the Mohegans, while the settlers of Connecticut, upon whom the war had fallen so heavily, came into possession of the Pequot land.

For nearly forty years the New England colonies were not again molested, the merciless vigor with which they had fought making a lasting impression upon their blood-thirsty foes. The cruel slavery to which the surviving natives were subjected, the English justified by the example of the Jews in their treatment of the Canaanites.

The Narragansett chief, Miantinomoh, had become the friend and ally of the English by a treaty ratified in 1636, mainly through the good offices of Roger Williams. In 1638, after the destruction of the Pequots, there was a new treaty, embracing Uncas with his bold Mohegans, and stipulating that any quarrel between Miantinomoh and Uncas should

be referred to the English. In 1642 Miantinomoh was accused of plotting against the English, and summoned before the General Court at Boston. Though acquitted he vowed revenge upon Uncas as the instigator of the charge. His friendship for Roger Williams, as also for Samuel Gorton, the purchaser of Shawomet, or Warwick, R. I., which was claimed by Massachusetts, had perhaps created a prejudice against him. At any rate, when a quarrel arose between Uncas and Sequasson, Miantinomoh's friend and ally, while the latter naturally sided with Sequasson, the sympathies of the English were with Uncas, who had aided them against the Pequots. With the consent of Connecticut and Massachusetts Miantinomoh took the field against Uncas, who had attacked Sequasson. He was defeated and taken prisoner. Carried to Hartford he was held to await the decision of the Commissioners of the United Colonies at Boston. They would not release him, yet had no valid ground for putting him to death. The case was referred to five clergymen, and they voted for his execution. For this purpose the commissioners gave orders to turn the brave warrior over to Uncas, English witnesses to be present and see that no cruelty was perpetrated. The sentence was carried into effect near Norwich. Cutting a piece of flesh from the shoulder of his murdered enemy, Uncas ate it with savage relish, declaring it to be the sweetest meat he had ever tasted.

The Dutch, too, as we have to some extent seen already, felt the horrors of Indian warfare. Kieft,

the Dutch director-general, a man cruel, avaricious, and obstinate, angered the red men by demanding tribute from them as their protector, while he refused them guns or ammunition. The savages replied that they had to their own cost shown kindness to the Dutch when in need of food, but would not pay tribute. Kieft attacked. Some of the Indians were killed and their crops destroyed. This roused their revengeful passions to the utmost. The Raritan savages visited the colony of De Vries, on Staten Island, with death and devastation. Reward was offered for the head of any one of the murderers. An Indian never forgot an injury. The nephew of one of the natives who twenty years before had been wantonly killed went to sell furs at Fort Amsterdam, and while there revenged his uncle's murder by the slaughter of an unoffending colonist. Spite of warlike preparations by Kieft and his assembly in 1641-42, the tribe would not give up the culprit. The following year another settler was knifed by a drunken Indian. Wampum was indeed offered in atonement, while an indignant plea was urged by the savages against the liquor traffic, which demoralized their young men and rendered them dangerous alike to friend and foe. But remonstrance and blood-money could not satisfy Kieft. At Pavonia and at Corlaer's Hook<sup>1</sup> the Dutch fell venomously upon the sleeping and unsuspecting enemy. Men, women, and children were slaughtered, none spared. In turn the tribes along the lower Hudson, to the

<sup>1</sup> Now in the New York City limits, just below Broadway Ferry, East River.

number of eleven, united and desperately attacked the Dutch wherever found. Only near the walls of Fort Amsterdam was there safety. The governor appointed a day of fasting, which it seems was kept with effect. The sale of liquor to the red men was at last prohibited, and peace for a time secured.

Soon, however, the redskins along the Hudson were again up in arms. The noted Underhill, who with Mason had been the scourge of the Pequots, came to the fight with fifty Englishmen as allies of the Dutch. Not waiting to be attacked, the Indians laid waste the settlements, even threatening Fort Amsterdam itself. At a place now known as Pelham Neck, near New Rochelle, lived the famous but unfortunate Mrs. Hutchinson, a fugitive from the persecuting zeal of Massachusetts. Here the implacable savages butchered her and her family in cold blood. Her little granddaughter alone was spared, and led captive to a far-off wigwam prison. Only at Gravesend, on Long Island, was a successful stand made, and that by a woman, Lady Deborah Moody, another exile from religious persecution, who with forty stout-hearted men defended her plantation and compelled the savages to beat a retreat.

The colony was in extremity. New Haven refused to aid, because, as a member of the New England confederacy, it could not act alone, and because it was not satisfied that the Dutch war was just. An appeal was made by Kieft's eight advisers to both the States-General and the West India Company in Holland. The sad condition of the

colonists was fully set forth, and the responsibility directly ascribed to the mismanagement of Kieft. At the same time, undismayed by the gloomy outlook, the courage of the sturdy Dutchmen rose with the emergency. Small parties were sent out against the Connecticut savages in the vicinity of Stamford. Indian villages on Long Island were surprised and the natives put to the sword. In two instances at least the victors disgraced humanity by torturing the captured.

In these engagements Underhill was conspicuous and most energetic. Having made himself familiar with the position of the Indians near Stamford, he sailed from Manhattan with one hundred and fifty men, landed at Greenwich, and, marching all day, at midnight drew near the enemy. His approach was not wholly unannounced, for the moon was full. The fight was desperate and bloody. The tragedy that had made memorable the banks of the Mystic in the destruction of the Pequot fort was now almost equalled. After the example of his old comrade Mason, Underhill fired the village. By flame, shot, or sword more than five hundred human beings perished.

While New Netherland was awaiting some message of cheer from Holland, a company of Dutch soldiers came from Curaçoa, but they did little to follow up the successes already gained. Again the Eight sent a memorial to the company, boldly condemning the conduct of the director and demanding his recall. Their remonstrances were at last heeded and the removal of the unpopular governor resolved upon. In 1647 Kieft set sail for Holland,

but the ship was wrecked and he with nearly all on board was drowned.

It was high time for a change. In the two years, 1643-45, while sixteen hundred Indians had been slain, Manhattan had become nearly depopulated. In 1645 peace was concluded, not only with the smaller tribes in the vicinity, but also with the powerful Mohawks about Fort Orange, and finally with all the Indians belonging to the Five Nations or acknowledging their authority. A pleasing incident of this treaty was the promise of the Indians to restore the eight-year-old granddaughter of Mrs. Hutchinson, a promise which they faithfully performed in 1646. The great compact was made under the shadow of the Fort Amsterdam walls, and the universal joy was expressed by a day of thanksgiving.

An interval of peace for ten years was now enjoyed, when the killing of a squaw for stealing some peaches led to an attack by several hundred of the infuriated savages upon New Amsterdam. They were repulsed here, but crossing to the shore of New Jersey they laid waste the settlements there. Staten Island, too, was swept with fire and sword. One hundred people were slain, 150 more taken captive, 300 made homeless. Peace was again effected and maintained for three years, when fresh quarrels began. It was not until 1660 that a more general and lasting treaty was brought about, on which occasion a Mohawk and a Minqua chief gave pledges in behalf of the Indians, and acted as mediators between the contending parties.





## PERIOD II.

### *ENGLISH AMERICA TILL THE END OF THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR*

1660-1763

#### CHAPTER I.

##### NEW ENGLAND UNDER THE LAST STUARTS

THE Commonwealth in England went to pieces at the death of Oliver Cromwell, its founder. The Stuart dynasty came back, but, alas! unimproved. Charles II. was a much meaner man than his father, and James II. was more detestable still. The rule of such kings was destined to work sad changes in the hitherto free condition of Massachusetts. This colony had sympathized with the Commonwealth more heartily than any of the others. Hither had fled for refuge Goffe and Whalley, two of the accomplices in the death of Charles I. Congregational church polity was here established by law, to the exclusion of all others, even of episcopacy, for whose sake Charles was harrying poor Covenanters to death on every hillside in Scotland. Nor would his lawyers let the king forget Charles I.'s attack on the Massachusetts charter, begun so early as 1635, or the grounds therefor, such as the unwarranted transfer of it to Boston, or the like-

lihood that but for the outbreak of the Civil War it would have been annulled by the Long Parliament itself. Obviously Massachusetts could not hope to be let alone by the home government which had just come in.

At first the king, graciously responding to the colony's humble petition, confirmed the charter granted by his father; but no sooner had he done so than the hot royalists about him began plotting to overthrow the same, and their purpose never slumbered till it was accomplished. Massachusetts was too prosperous and too visibly destined for great power in America to be suffered longer to go its independent way as hitherto.

The province—as yet, of course, excluding Plymouth with its twelve towns and five thousand inhabitants—contained at this time, 1660, about twenty-five thousand souls, living in fifty-two towns. These were nearly all on the coast; Dedham, Concord, Brookfield, Lancaster, Marlborough, and the Connecticut Valley hamlets of Springfield, Hadley, and Northampton being the most noteworthy exceptions. Though agriculture was the principal business, fishing was a staple industry, its product going to France, Spain, and the Straits. Pipe-staves, fir-boards, much material for ships, as masts, pitch and tar, also pork and beef, horses and corn, were shipped from this colony to Virginia, in return for tobacco and sugar either for home consumption or for export to England. Some iron was manufactured. The province enjoyed great prosperity. Boston stood forth as a lively and growing centre, and an English traveller

about this time declared some of its merchants to be "damnable rich."

As their most precious possession the colonists prized their liberties, which they claimed in virtue of their original patent. In a paper which it put forth on June 10, 1661, the General Court asserted for the colony the right to elect and empower its own officers, both high and low, to make its laws, to execute the same without appeal so long as they were not repugnant to those of England, and to defend itself by force and arms when necessary, against every infringement of its rights, even from acts of Parliament or of the king, if prejudicial to the country or contrary to just colonial legislation. In a word, Massachusetts, even so early, regarded itself to all intents and purposes an independent State, and would have proclaimed accordingly had it felt sufficiently strong.

Manifestly the king would not grant so much. On the occasion of his confirming the charter he demanded that the oath of allegiance be taken by the people of the colony; that justice be administered there in his name; and that the franchise be extended to all freemen of sufficient substance, with the liberty to use in worship, public and private, the forms of the English Church. The people obeyed but in part, for they would not even appear to admit the king's will to be their law. The franchise was slightly extended, in a grudging way, but no new religious privileges were at this time conceded. Unfortunately political and religious liberty were now in conflict. It was worse for the Baptists and Quakers that the king favored them,

and the treatment which they received in the colony inclined them to the royalist side in the controversy.

In July, 1664, commissioners arrived in Boston with full authority to investigate the administration of the New England charters. Such a procedure not being provided for in the Massachusetts document, the General Court, backed by the citizens almost to a man, successfully prevented complainants from appearing before the commission. The commissioners having summoned the colony as defendant in a certain case, a herald trumpeted proclamation through the streets, on the morning set for the trial, inhibiting all from aiding their designs. The trial collapsed, and the gentlemen who had ordered it, baffled and disgusted, moved on to New Hampshire, there also to be balked by a decree of the Massachusetts Governor and Council forbidding the towns so much as to meet at their behest.

Vengeance for such defiance was delayed by Charles II.'s very vices. Clarendon's fall had left him surrounded by profligate aides, too timid and too indolent to face the resolute men of Massachusetts. They often discussed the contumacy of the colony, but went no further than words. Massachusetts was even encouraged, in 1668, forcibly to re-assert its authority in Maine, against rule either by the king or by Sir Ferdinando Gorges's heir as proprietary.

Its charter had assigned to the colony land to a point three miles north of the Merrimac. Bold in the favor of the Commonwealth, the authorities

measured from the head-waters of that river. But Plymouth had originally claimed all the territory west of the Kennebec, and had sold it to Gorges. Charles II. favored the Gorges heirs against Massachusetts, and for some years previous to 1668 Massachusetts' power over Maine had been in abeyance. Ten years later, in 1678, to make assurance doubly sure, Massachusetts bought off the Gorges claimants, at the round price of twelve hundred and fifty pounds sterling.

From 1641 Massachusetts had borne sway in New Hampshire as well, ignoring John Mason's claim under Charles I.'s charters of 1629 and 1635, still urged by one of Mason's grandsons, backed by Charles II. Here Massachusetts was beaten. In July, 1679, New Hampshire was permanently separated from her, and erected into a royal province, of a nature to be explained in a subsequent chapter, being the earliest government of this kind in New England.

These territorial assumptions on the part of Massachusetts much increased the king's hostility. This probably would not have proved fatal had it not been re-enforced by the determination of the merchants and manufacturers of the mother-country to crush what they feared was becoming a rival power beyond seas. They insisted upon full enforcement of the Navigation Laws, which made America's foreign trade in a cruel degree subservient to English interest. So incorrigible was the colony, it was found that this end could be compassed only by the abrogation of the charter, so that English law might become immediately valid

in Massachusetts, colonial laws to the contrary notwithstanding. Accordingly, in 1684, the charter was vacated and the colonists ceased to be free, their old government with its popular representation giving away to an arbitrary commission.

The other New England colonies—Plymouth, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Haven—had made haste to proclaim Charles II. so soon as restored to the throne, and to begin carrying on their governments in his name. That beautiful and able man, the younger Winthrop, sped to London on Connecticut's behalf, and, aided by his colony's friends at court, the Earls of Clarendon and Manchester and Viscount Say and Seal, in 1662 secured to Connecticut, now made to include New Haven, a charter so liberal that it continued till October 5, 1818, the ground law of the State, then to be supplanted only by a close vote. Under this paper, which declared all lands between the Narraganset River and the Pacific Ocean Connecticut territory, Connecticut received every whit of that right to govern itself which Charles was so sternly challenging in the case of Massachusetts.

From this time on, as indeed earlier, Connecticut was for many years perhaps the most delightful example of popular government in all history. Connecticut and New Haven together had about ten thousand inhabitants. Their rulers were just, wise, and of a mind truly to serve the people. Here none were persecuted for their faith. Education was universal. Few were poor, none very rich. Nearly all supplies were of domestic

production, nothing as yet being exported but a few cattle.

Under the second Charles Rhode Island fared quite as well as Connecticut. This was remarkable, inasmuch as the little colony of three thousand souls, in their four towns of Providence, Newport, Portsmouth, and Warwick, insisted on "holding forth the lively experiment"—and it proved lively indeed—"of full liberty in religious concernments." Charles did not oppose this, and Clarendon favored it, a motive of both here, as with Connecticut, being to rear in New England a power friendly to the crown, that should rival and check Massachusetts. Both these commonwealths were granted absolute independence in all but name. No oath of allegiance to the king was demanded. Appeals to England were not provided for.

Though having no quarrel with the king, the two southern colonies were not without their trials. Connecticut, besides continual fear of the Dutch and the Indians, was much agitated by the controversy over the question whether children of moral parents not church members should be baptized, a question at length settled affirmatively by the so-called Half-Way Covenant. It also had its boundary disputes with Massachusetts, with Rhode Island—for Connecticut took the Narraganset River of its charter to be the bay of that name—and with New York, which, by the Duke of York's new patent, issued on the recovery of that province from the Dutch in 1674, reached the Connecticut River. During England's war with Holland, 1672-74, all the colonies stood in some fear of Dutch attacks.

Rhode Island had worse troubles than Connecticut. It, too, had boundary disputes, serious and perpetual; but graver by much were its internal feuds, caused partly by the mutual jealousy of its four towns, partly by the numerous and jarring religious persuasions here represented. Government was painfully feeble. Only with utmost difficulty could the necessary taxes be raised. Warwick in particular was for some time in arrears to John Clark, of Newport, for his invaluable services in securing the charter of 1663. Quakers and the divers sorts of Baptists valiantly warred each against other, using, with dreadful address, those most deadly of carnal weapons, tongue and pen. On George Fox's visit to the colony, Roger Williams, zealous for a debate, pursued the eminent Quaker from Providence to Newport, rowing thither in his canoe and arriving at midnight, only to find that his intended opponent had departed. The latter's champion was ready, however, and a discussion of four days ensued.

Before its sentence of death reached Massachusetts Charles II. was no more, and James II., his brother, had ascended the throne. It was for a time uncertain what sort of authority the stricken colony would be called to accept. Already, as Duke of York, James II. had been Proprietary of Maine east of the Kennebec (Sagadahoc), as well as of Delaware, New Jersey, and New York. Now that he had the problem of ruling Massachusetts to solve, it naturally occurred to the king to make Sir Edmund Andros, already Governor of



New York, master also over the whole of English America from the Saint Croix to the Delaware.

In southern New England the reign of Andros wrought no downright persecution. He suspended the charters, and, with an irresponsible council in each colony, assumed all legislative as well as administrative power. Rhode Island submitted tamely. Her sister colony did the same, save that, at Hartford, according to good tradition, in the midst of the altercation about delivering the charter, prolonged into candle-light, suddenly it was dark and the precious document disappeared to a secure place in the hollow trunk of an oak. This tree, henceforth called the Charter Oak, stood till prostrated by a gale on August 20th, 1856.

But in Massachusetts the colonists' worst fears were realized. Andros, with a council of his own creation, made laws, levied taxes, and controlled the militia. He had authority to suppress all printing-presses and to encourage Episcopacy. In the latter interest he opened King's Chapel to the Prayer Book. His permission was required for any one to leave the colony. Extortionate fees and taxes were imposed. Puritans had to swear on the Bible, which they regarded wicked, or be disfranchised. Personal and proprietary rights were summarily set at naught, and all deeds to land were declared void till renewed—for money, of course. The citizens were reduced to a condition hardly short of slavery.

There is no describing the joy which pervaded New England as the news of the Revolution of 1688 flew from colony to colony. Andros slunk

away from Boston, glad to escape alive. Drums beat and gala-day was kept. Old magistrates were reinstated. Town meetings were resumed. All believed that God had interposed, in answer to prayer, to bring deliverance to his people from popery and thralldom.

This revolution, ushering in the liberal monarchy of William and Mary, restored to Rhode Island and Connecticut their old charter governments in full. New Hampshire, after a momentary union with Massachusetts again, became once more a royal province. As to Massachusetts itself, a large party of the citizens now either did not wish the old state of things renewed, or were too timid to agree in demanding back their charter as of right. Had they been bold and united, they might have succeeded in this without any opposition from the crown. Instead, a new charter was conferred, creating Massachusetts also a royal province, yet with government more liberal than the other provinces of this order enjoyed. The governor was appointed by the crown, and could convene, adjourn, or dissolve the Legislature. With the consent of his counsel he also created the judges, from whose highest sentence appeal could be taken to the Privy Council. The governor could veto legislation, and the king annul any law under three years old.

If in these things the new polity was inferior to the old, in two respects it was superior: Suffrage was now practically universal, and every species of religious profession, save Catholicism, made legal. Also, Massachusetts territory was enlarged south-

ward to take in all Plymouth, eastward to embrace Maine (Sagadahoc), and Nova Scotia. Maine, henceforth including Sagadahoc, that is, all land eastward to the Saint Croix, remained part of Massachusetts till March 15, 1820, when it became a member of the Union by itself. Nova Scotia, over which Phips's conquest of Port Royal in 1690 had established a nominal rather than a real English authority, was assigned to France again by the Treaty of Ryswick, 1697.

## CHAPTER II.

### KING PHILIP'S WAR

SIMULTANEOUSLY with the Stuart Restoration another cloud darkened the New England sky. Since the Pequot War, Indians and whites had in the main been friendly. This by itself is proof that our fathers were less unjust to the red men than is sometimes charged. They did assume the right to acquire lands here, and they had this right. The Indians were not in any proper sense owners of New England. They were few—by 1660 not more numerous than the pale-faces—and, far from settling or occupying the land, roamed from place to place. Had it been otherwise they, as barbarians, would have had no such claim upon the territory as to justify them in barring out civilization. However, the colonists did not plead this consideration. Whenever districts were desired to which Indians had any obvious title, it was both law and custom to pay them their price. In this Roger Williams and William Penn were not peculiar. If individual white men sometimes cheated in land trades, as in other negotiations, the aggrieved side could not, and did not, regard this as the white man's policy.

Yet little by little the Indians came to distrust

and hate the rival race. It did not matter to the son of the forest, even if he thought so far, that the neighborhood of civilization greatly bettered his lot in many things, as, for instance, giving him market for corn and peltry, which he could exchange for fire-arms, blankets, and all sorts of valuable conveniences. The efforts to teach and elevate him he appreciated still less. As has been said, he loved better to disfigure the outside of other people's heads than to furnish the inside of his own. What he felt, and keenly, was that the new-comers treated him as an inferior, were day by day narrowing his range, and slowly but surely reducing his condition to that of a subject people. Dull as he was he saw that one of three fates confronted him : to perish, to migrate, or to lay aside his savage character and mode of life. Such thoughts frenzied him.

The beautiful fidelity of Massasoit to the people of Plymouth is already familiar. His son Alexander, who succeeded him, was of a spirit diametrically the reverse. Convinced that he was plotting with the Narragansets for hostile action, the Governor and Council of Plymouth sent Major Winslow to bring him to court—for it must be remembered that Massasoit's tribe, the Pokanokets, had through him covenanted, though probably with no clear idea of what this meant, to be subject to the Plymouth government. Alexander, for some reason, became fatally ill while at Plymouth under arrest, dying before reaching home. The Indians suspected poison.

His brother Philip now became sachem. Philip

already had a grudge against the whites, and was rendered trebly bitter by the indignity and violence, if nothing worse, to which Alexander had been subjected. He resolved upon war, and in 1675 war was begun.

We shall never certainly know to what extent Philip was an organizer. We believe correct the view of Hubbard, the contemporary historian, that he had prepared a wide-spread and pretty well arranged conspiracy among the main tribes of New England Indians, which might have been fatal but for "the special providence of God," causing hostilities to break out ere the savages were ready. Palfrey challenges this view of the case, but on insufficient grounds.

One Sausaman, an educated Indian, previously Philip's secretary, had left him and joined the Christian Indians settled at Natick. There were by this time several such communities; and also, according to Cotton Mather, many able Indian preachers. At the risk of his life, as he insisted, Sausaman had warned the Plymouth magistrates that danger impended. He was soon murdered, apparently by Philip's instigation. At least Philip never denied this, nor did he after this time ever again court friendly relations with Plymouth, which he had constantly done hitherto. On the contrary, re-enforcements of strange Indians, all ready for the war-path, were continually flocking to his camp, squaws and children at the same time going to the Narraganset country, manifestly for security.

The Plymouth authorities, preparing for war, yet sent a kind letter to the sachem advising him

to peace. In vain. At Swanzey, the town nearest Mount Hope, Philip's home, Indians at once began to kill and ravage, and Majors Bradford and Cudworth marched thither with a force of Plymouth soldiers. A Massachusetts contingent re-enforced them there, and they prepared to advance. Seeing it impossible to hold his own against so many, Philip crossed to Pocasset, now Tiverton, and swept rapidly round to Dartmouth, Middleborough, and Taunton, burning and murdering as he went. He then retired again to Tiverton, but in a few days started with all his warriors for central Massachusetts.

Here the Nipmucks, already at war, which indicated an understanding between them and the Pokanokets, had attacked Mendon. The day after Philip joined them there was a fight at Brookfield, the Nipmucks and their allies being victorious. They proceeded to burn the town nearly entire, though the inhabitants who survived, after a three days' siege in a fortified house, were relieved by troops from Boston just in the nick of time.

The Connecticut Valley was next the theatre of war. Springfield, Hatfield, Deerfield, and Northfield were attacked, the last two having to be abandoned. At Hadley the onset occurred on a fast-day. The men rushed from their worship with their muskets, which were ready to hand in church, and hastily formed for battle. Bewildered by the unexpected assault, they were on the point of yielding, when, according to tradition, an aged hero with long beard and queer clothing appeared, placed himself at their head and directed their move-

ments. His evident acquaintance with fighting restored order and courage. The savages were driven pell-mell out of town, but the pursuers looked in vain for their deliverer. If the account is correct, it was the regicide, General Goffe, who had been a secret guest in the house of the Rev. Mr. Russell. He could not in such danger refrain from engaging once again, as he had so often done during the Civil War in England, in the defence of God's people.

From Hadley a party went to Deerfield to bring in the wheat that had been left when the town was deserted. Ninety picked men, the "flower of Essex," led by Captain Lothrop, attended the wagons as convoy. On their return, about seven o'clock in the morning, by a little stream in the present village of South Deerfield, since called Bloody Brook in memory of the event, the soldiers dispersed somewhat in quest of grapes, then ripe, when a sudden and fatal volley from an ambush was delivered upon them. The men had left their muskets in the wagons and could not regain them. Lothrop was shot dead, and but seven or eight of his company escaped alive. A monument marks the spot where this tragic affair occurred.

So early as July, 1675, Massachusetts and Connecticut, acting for the New England Confederation, had effected a treaty with the strong tribe of the Narragansets in southern Rhode Island, engaging them to remain neutral and to surrender any of Philip's men coming within their jurisdiction. This agreement they did not keep. After the attacks on Springfield and Hatfield in October,



great numbers of the Pokanoket braves came to them, evidently welcomed. To prevent their becoming a centre of mischief, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Plymouth despatched a thousand men to punish the Narragansets. They met the foe at the old Palisade, in the midst of a dense swamp in what is now South Kingstown, Rhode Island. The terrible cold which rendered this Narraganset campaign so severe had turned the marsh into a bridge, and at once on their arrival the soldiers, weary and hungry as they were from their long march, and spite of its being Sunday, advanced to the attack. Massachusetts was in front, then Plymouth, then Connecticut. Long and bitter was the fight. The Indians, perfect marksmen, took deadly aim at the leaders. Five captains were killed outright and as many more mortally wounded. The fort was taken, re-taken, and taken again, the whites at last, to make sure work, setting fire to the wigwams. The storming party lost in killed and wounded one-fifth of its number. This Swamp Fight, as it was called, broke forever the strength of the Narragansets, the tribe and its allies dispersing in all directions.

In 1676 central Massachusetts was again aflame. Lancaster was sacked and burned, its inhabitants nearly all either carried captive or put to death with indescribable atrocities. Mrs. Rowlandson, wife of the Lancaster minister, also her son and two daughters, were among the captives. We have this brave woman's story as subsequently detailed by herself. Her youngest, a little girl of six, wounded by a bullet, she bore in her arms wher-

ever they marched, till the poor creature died of cold, starvation, and lack of care. The agonized mother begged the privilege of tugging along the corpse, but was refused. She with her son and living daughter were ransomed, after wandering up and down with the savages eleven weeks and five days.

From Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative we have many interesting facts touching the Indians' habits of life. They carried ample stores from Lancaster, but soon squandered them, and were reduced to a diet of garbage, horses' entrails, ears, and liver, with broth made of horses' feet and legs. The liver they seemed to prefer raw. Their chief food was ground nuts. They also ate acorns, artichokes, beans, and various sorts of roots. They especially delighted in old bones, which, being heated to drive out maggots and worms, they first boiled for soup, then ground for use as meal.

The captive lady often saw Philip. At his request she made a shirt and a cap for his son, for which he paid her. Says Hubbard, "such was the goodness of God to these poor captive women and children that they found so much favor in the sight of their enemies that they offered no wrong to any of their persons save what they could not help, being in many wants themselves. Neither did they offer any uncivil carriage to any of the females, nor ever attempt the chastity of any of them." So soon as negotiations were opened for Mrs. Rowlandson's release, Philip told her of this, and expressed the hope that they would succeed. When her ransom had arrived he met her with a

smile, saying: "I have pleasant words for you this morning; would you like to hear them? You are to go home to-morrow." Twenty pounds were paid for her, raised by some ladies of Boston, aided by a Mr. Usher.

Hostilities now bore southeastward. Philip was in his glory. All the towns of Rhode Island and eastern Massachusetts were in terror, nearly all in actual danger. At Medfield twenty whites were killed. Deserted Mendon was burned. Weymouth was attacked and eleven persons were massacred in the edge of Plymouth. In Groton and Marlborough every house was laid in ashes, as were all in lower Rhode Island up to Warwick, and in Warwick all but one. Sachem Canonchet of the Narragansets drew into ambush at Pawtuxet a band of Plymouth soldiers, of whom only one escaped. Canonchet was subsequently taken by Captain Denison and executed. Rehoboth lost forty houses, Providence nearly as many.

The Connecticut Valley was invaded afresh. Springfield, Hadley, Northampton, and Hatfield were once more startled by the war whoop and the whiz of the tomahawk. Captain Turner, hearing of an Indian camp at the falls of the Connecticut, now called by his name, in Montague, advanced with a troop of one hundred and eighty horse, arriving in sight of the encampment at daylight. Dismounting and proceeding stealthily to within sure shot, they beat up the Indians' quarters with a ringing volley of musketry. Resistance was impossible. Those who did not fall by bullet or sword rushed to the river, many being carried

over the falls. Three hundred savages perished, the English losing but one man. A large stock of the enemy's food and ammunition was also destroyed. Though so splendidly successful, the party did not return to Hadley without considerable loss, being set upon much of the way by Indians who had heard the firing at the falls and sped to the relief of their friends. Turner was killed in the meadows by Green River, his subordinate, Holyoke, then commanding the retreat.

Turner's victory brought the war to a crisis. The red men lacked resources. The whites had learned the secrets of savage warfare. They could no longer be led into ambush, while their foe at no time during the war ventured to engage them in open field. Large parties of Indians began to surrender; many roving bands were captured. Hostilities continued still many months in Maine, the whites more and more uniformly successful, till the Treaty of Casco, April 12, 1678, at last terminated the war.

Hunted by the English backward and forward, Philip was at last driven to his old home upon Mount Hope. Here Captain Church, one of the most practised of Indian fighters, surprised him on the morning of August 12, 1676, encamped upon a little upland, which it is believed has been exactly identified near a swamp at the foot of the mountain. By residents in the neighborhood it is known as Little Guinea. At the first firing Philip, but partially dressed, seized gun and powder-horn and made for the swamp. Captain Church's ambush was directly in his front. An Englishman's

piece missed fire, but an Indian's sent a bullet through the Great Sachem's heart.

In this fearful war at least six hundred of the English inhabitants either fell in battle or were murdered by the enemy. A dozen or more towns were utterly destroyed, others greatly damaged. Some six hundred buildings, chiefly dwelling-houses, were consumed by fire, and over a hundred thousand pounds of colonial money expended, to say nothing of the immense losses in goods and cattle.

Not without propriety has the Pokanoket chief been denominated a king. If not a Charlemagne or a Louis XIV., he yet possessed elements of true greatness. While he lived his mind evidently guided, as his will dominated and prolonged, the war. This is saying much, for the Indian's disinclination to all strenuous or continuous exertion was pronounced and proverbial. Philip's treatment of Mrs. Rowlandson must be declared magnanimous, especially as, of course, he was but a savage king, who might reasonably request us not to measure him by our rules. The other party to the war we have a right to judge more rigidly, and just sentence in their case must be severe. Philip's sorrowing, innocent wife and son were brought prisoners to Plymouth, and their lot referred to the ministers. After long deliberation and prayer it was decided that they should be sold into slavery, and this was their fate.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE SALEM WITCHCRAFT

THE home life of colonial New England was unique. Its like has appeared nowhere else in human history. Mostwise it was beautiful as well. In it religion was central and supreme. The General Court of Plymouth very early passed the following order: "Noe dwelling-howse shal be builte above halfe a myle from the meeting-howse in any newe plantacion without leave from the Court, except mylle-howses and fferme-howses." In laying out a village the meeting-house, as the hub to which everything was to be referred, was located first of all. The minister's lot commonly adjoined. Then a sufficiency of land was parcelled off to each freeholder whereon to erect his dwelling. Massachusetts from the first, and Plymouth beginning somewhat later, also made eminent provision for schools—all in the interest of religion.

The earliest residences were necessarily of logs, shaped and fitted more or less rudely according to the skill of the builder or the time and means at his disposal. There was usually one large room below, which served as kitchen, dining-room, sitting-room, and parlor, and on the same floor with

this one or two lodging-rooms. An unfinished attic constituted the dormitory for the rising generation. A huge stone chimney, terminating below in a still more capacious fireplace, that would admit logs from four to eight feet in length, conveyed away the smoke, and with it much of the heat. This involved no loss, as wood was a drug. Communicating with the chimney was the great stone baking-oven, whence came the bouncing loaves of corn-bread, duly "brown," the rich-colored "pompion" pies, and the loin of venison, beef, or pork.

Over these bounties—and such they were heartily esteemed, however meagre—often as the family drew around the table, its head offered thanks to the heavenly Giver. Each morning, after they had eaten, he read a goodly portion of God's Word, never less than a chapter, and then, not kneeling but standing, led his household in reverent and believing prayer for protection, guidance, stimulus in good, and for every needed grace. What purity, what love of rectitude, what strength of will did not the builders of America carry forth from that family altar! He who would understand the richest side and the deepest moving forces of our national life and development must not overlook those New England fireside scenes.

Prayers ended, the "men folks" went forth to the day's toil. It was hard, partly from its then rough character, partly from poverty of appliances. For the hardest jobs neighbors would join hands, fighting nature as they had to fight the

Indians, unitedly. Farming tools, if of iron or steel, as axe, mattock, spade, and the iron nose for the digger or the plough, the village blacksmith usually fashioned, as he did the bake-pan, griddle, crane, and pothooks, for indoor use. Tables, chairs, cradles, bedsteads, and those straight-backed "settles" of which a few may yet be seen, were either home-made or gotten up by the village carpenter. Mattresses were at first of hay, straw, leaves, or rushes. Before 1700, however, featherbeds were common, and houses and the entire state of a New England farmer's home had become somewhat more lordly than the above picture might indicate. The colonists made much use of berries, wild fruits, bread and milk, game, fish, and shellfish. The stock wandered in the forests and about the brooks, to be brought home at night by the boys, whom the sound of the cow-bell led. In autumn bushels upon bushels of nuts were laid by, to serve, along with dried berries and grapes, salted fish and venison, as food for the winter. Every phase and circumstance of this pioneer life reminded our fathers of their dependence upon nature and the Supreme Power behind nature, while at the same time the continual need and application of neighbor's co-operation with neighbor brought out brotherly love in charming strength and beauty.

But to old New England religion, as a clerical, public, and organized affair, there is a far darker side. In the eighteenth century belief in witchcraft was nearly universal. In 1683 one Margaret Matron was tried in Pennsylvania on a charge of



bewitching cows and geese, and placed under bonds of one hundred pounds for good behavior. In 1705 Grace Sherwood was ducked in Virginia for the same offence. Cases of the kind had occurred in New York. There was no colony where the belief in astrology, necromancy, second sight, ghosts, haunted houses and spots, love-spells, charms, and peculiar powers attaching to rings, herbs, etc., did not prevail. Such credulity was not peculiar to America but cursed Europe as well. It seemed to flourish, if anything, after the Reformation more than before. Luther firmly believed in witchcraft. He professed to have met the Evil One in personal conflict, and to have vanquished him by the use of an inkstand as missile. Perhaps every land in Europe had laws making witchcraft a capital crime. One was enacted in England under Henry VIII., another in James I.'s first year, denouncing death against all persons "invoking any evil spirit, or consulting, covenanting with, entertaining, employing, feeding, or rewarding any evil spirit, or taking up dead bodies from their graves to be used in any witchcraft, sorcery, charm, or enchantment, or killing or otherwise hurting any person by such infernal arts." A similar statute was contained in the "Fundamentals" of Massachusetts, probably inspired by the command of Scripture, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." This law, we shall see, was not a dead letter.

No wonder such a law was of more effect in New England than anywhere else on earth. The official religion of the Puritans was not only superstitious in general but gloomy in particular,

and most gloomy in New England. Its central tenet, here at least, seemed to be that life ought to furnish no joy, men seeking to "merit heaven by making earth a hell." Sunday laws were severe, and rigidly enforced from six o'clock Saturday evening till the same hour the next. Not the least work was allowed unless absolutely necessary, nor any semblance of amusement. Boys bringing home the cows were cautioned to "let down the bars softly, as it was the Lord's day." Sunday travellers were arrested and fined. Men might be whipped for absence from church. A girl at Plymouth was threatened exile as a street-walker for smiling in meeting. Increase Mather traced the great Boston fire of 1711 to the sin of Sunday labor, such as carrying parcels and baking food. In Newport, some men having been drowned who, to say good-by to departing friends, had rowed out to a ship just weighing anchor, Rev. John Comer prayed that others might take warning and "do no more such great wickedness."

Sermons were often two hours long; public prayer half an hour. Worse still was what went by the name of music—doggerel hymns full of the most sulphurous theology, uttered congregationally as "lined off" by the leader—nasal, dissonant, and discordant in the highest imaginable degree. The church itself was but a barn, homely-shaped, bare, and in winter cold as out-of-doors. At this season men wrapped their feet in bags, and women stuffed their muffs with hot stones. Sleepers were rudely awakened by the tithing-man's baton thwacking their heads; or, if females, by its fox-tail

end brushing their cheeks. Fast-days were common. Prayer opened every public meeting, secular as well as religious. The doctrine of special providences was pressed to a ridiculous extreme. The devil was believed in no less firmly than God, and indefinitely great power ascribed to him. The Catechism—book second in authority only to the Bible—contained of his Satanic Majesty a cut, which children were left, not to say taught, to suppose as correct a likeness as that of Cromwell, which crowned the mantels of so many homes.

In a people thus trained the miracle is not that witchcraft and superstition did so much mischief, but so little. Had it not been for their sturdy Saxon good sense its results must have proved infinitely more sad. The first remarkable case of sorcery in New England occurred at Boston, in 1688. Four children of a pious family were affected in a peculiar manner, imitating the cries of cats and dogs, and complaining of pains all over their bodies. These were the regulation symptoms of witch-possession, which presumably they had often heard discussed. An old Irish serving-woman, indentured to the family, who already bore the name of a witch, was charged with having bewitched them, and executed, the four ministers of Boston having first held at the house a day of prayer and fasting.

Young Cotton Mather, grandson of the distinguished Rev. John Cotton, a man of vast erudition and fervent piety, was at this time colleague to his father, Increase Mather, as pastor of the Boston North Church. His imagination had been abnor-

mally developed by fasts and vigils, in which he believed himself to hold uncommonly close communication with the Almighty. His desire to provide new arms for faith against the growing unbelief of his time led him to take one of the "bewitched" children to his house, that he might note and describe the ways of the devil in her case. The results he soon after published in his "Memorable Providences Relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions." This work admitted no doubt as to the reality of the demoniac possessions, which indeed it affected to demonstrate forever. All the Boston ministers signed its preface, certifying to its "clear information" that "both a God and a devil, and witchcraft" existed. "Nothing too vile," it alleged, "can be said of, nothing too hard can be done to, such a horrible iniquity as witchcraft is." The publication excited great attention, and to it in no small measure the ensuing tragedy may be traced.

In February, 1692, three more subjects, children of Rev. Mr. Parris, minister at Danvers, then called Salem Village, exhibited bad witchcraft symptoms. The utmost excitement prevailed. Neighboring clergymen joined the village in fasting and prayer. A general fast for the colony was ordered. But the "devilism," as Cotton Mather named it, spread instead of abating, the children having any number of imitators so soon as they became objects of general notice and sympathy. Old Tituba, an Indian crone, who had served in Parris's family, was the first to be denounced as the cause. Two other aged females, one crazy, the other bed-ridden, were

also presently accused, and after a little while several ladies of Parris's church. Whoso uttered a whisper of incredulity, general or as to the blameworthiness of any whom Parris called guilty, was instantly indicted with them.

On April 11th, the Deputy Governor held in the meeting-house in Salem Village a court for a preliminary examination of the prisoners. A scene at once ridiculous and tragic followed. When they were brought in, their alleged victims appeared overcome at their gaze, pretending to be bitten, pinched, scratched, choked, burned, or pricked by their invisible agency in revenge for refusing to subscribe to a covenant with the devil. Some were apparently stricken down by the glance of an eye from one of the culprits, others fainted, many writhed as in a fit. Tituba was beaten to make her confess. Others were tortured. Finally all the accused were thrown into irons. Numbers of accused persons, assured that it was their only chance for life, owned up to deeds of which they must have been entirely innocent. They had met the devil in the form of a small black man, had attended witch sacraments, where they renounced their Christian vows, and had ridden through the air on broomsticks. Such were the confessions of poor women who had never in their lives done any evil except possibly to tattle.

On June 2d, a special court was held in Salem for the definite trial. Stoughton, Lieutenant Governor, a man of small mind and bigoted temper, was president. The business began by the condemnation and hanging of a helpless woman. A

jury of women had found on her person a wart, which was pronounced to be unquestionably a "devil's teat," and her neighbors remembered that many hens had died, animals become lame, and carts upset by her dreadful "devilism." By September 23d, twenty persons had gone to the gallows, eight more were under sentence, and fifty-five had "confessed" and turned informers as their only hope. The "afflicted" had increased to fifty. Jails were crammed with persons under accusation, and fresh charges of alliance with devils were brought forward every day.

Some of the wretched victims displayed great fortitude. Goodman Procter lost his life by nobly and persistently—vainly as well, alas!—maintaining the innocence of his accused wife. George Burroughs, who had formerly preached in Salem Village, was indicted. His physical strength, which happened to be phenomenal, was adduced as lent him from the devil. Stoughton browbeat him through his whole trial. What sealed his condemnation, however, was his offer to the jury of a paper quoting an author who denied the possibility of witchcraft. His fervent prayers when on the scaffold, and especially his correct rendering of the Lord's prayer, shook the minds of many. They argued that no witch could have gotten through those holy words correctly—a test upon which several had been condemned. Cotton Mather, present at the gallows, restored the crowd to faith by reminding them that the devil had the power to dress up like an angel of light. Rebecca Nurse, a woman of unimpeachable character hith-

erto, unable from partial deafness to understand, so as to explain, the allegations made against her, was convicted notwithstanding every proof in her favor.

Reaction now began. Public opinion commenced to waver. No one knew whose turn to be hanged would come next. Emboldened by their fatal success, accusers whispered of people in high places as leagued with the Evil One. An Andover minister narrowly escaped death. The Beverly minister, Hale, one of the most active in denouncing witches, was aghast when his own wife was accused. Two sons of Governor Bradstreet were obliged to flee for their lives, one for refusing, as a magistrate, to issue any more warrants, the other charged with bewitching a dog. Several hurried to New York to escape conviction. The property of such was seized by their towns. A reign of terror prevailed.

People slowly awoke to the terrible travesty of justice which was going on. Magistrates were seen to have overlooked the most flagrant instances of falsehood and contradiction on the part of both accusers and accused, using the baseless hypothesis that the devil had warped their senses. The disgusting partiality shown in the accusations was disrelished, as was the resort that had been had to torture. One poor old man of eighty they crushed to death because he would plead guilty to nothing. The authorities quite disregarded the fact that everyone of the self-accusations had been made in order to escape punishment. These considerations effected a revolution in the minds of most peo-

ple. Remonstrances were presented to the courts, securing reprieve for those under sentence of death at Salem. This so irritated the despicable Stoughton that he resigned.

The forwardness of the ministers therein turned many against the persecution. After the first victims had fallen at Salem, Governor Phips took their advice whether or not to proceed. Cotton Mather indited the reply. It thankfully acknowledges "the success which the merciful God has given to the sedulous and assiduous endeavors of our honorable rulers to defeat the abominable witchcrafts which have been committed in the country, humbly praying that the discovery of those mysterious and mischievous wickednesses may be perfected." It is pleasant to note, after all, the ministers' advice to the civil rulers not to rely too much on "the devil's authority"—on the evidence, that is, of those possessed. The court heeded this injunction all too little, but by and by it had weight with the public, who judged that, as the trials appeared to be proceeding on devil's evidence alone, the farce ought to cease. The Superior Court met in Boston, April 25, 1693, and the grand jury declined to find any more bills against persons accused of sorcery. King William vetoed the Witchcraft Act, and by the middle of 1693 all the prisoners were discharged.



## CHAPTER IV.

### THE MIDDLE COLONIES

THE English conquest of New Netherland from the Dutch speedily followed the Stuarts' return to the throne. Cromwell had mooted an attack on Dutch America, and, as noticed in Chapter I., Connecticut's charter of 1662 extended that colony to include the Dutch lands. England based her claim to the territory on alleged priority of discovery, but the real motives were the value of the Hudson as an avenue for trade, and the desire to range her colonies along the Atlantic coast in one unbroken line. The victory was not bloody, nor was it offensive to the Dutch themselves, who in the matter of liberties could not lose. King Charles had granted the conquered tract to his brother, the Duke of York, subsequently James II., and it was in his honor christened with its present name of New York.

The Duke's government was not popular, especially as it ordered the Dutch land-patents to be renewed—for money, of course; and in 1673, war again existing between England and Holland, the Dutch recovered their old possession. They held it however for only fifteen months, since at the Peace of 1674 the two belligerent nations mutually restored all the posts which they had won.

The reader already has some idea of Sir Edmond Andros's rule in America. New York was the first to feel this, coming under the gentleman's government immediately on being the second time surrendered to England. Such had been the political disorder in the province that Andros's headship, stern as it was, proved beneficial. He even, for a time, 1683-86, reluctantly permitted an elective legislature, though discontinuing it when the legislatures of New England were suppressed. This taste of freedom had its effect afterward.

When news of the Revolution of 1688 in England reached New York, Andros was in Boston. Nicholson, Lieutenant-Governor, being a Catholic and an absolutist, and the colony now in horror of all Catholics through fear of French invasion from Canada, Jacob Leisler, a German adventurer, partly anticipating, partly obeying the popular wish, assumed to function in Nicholson's stead. All the aristocracy, English or Dutch, and nearly all the English of the lower rank were against him. Leisler was passionate and needlessly bitter toward Catholics, yet he meant well. He viewed his office as only transitory, and stood ready to surrender it so soon as the new king's will could be learned; but when Sloughter arrived with commission as governor, Leisler's foes succeeded in compassing his execution for treason. This unjust and cruel deed began a long feud between the popular and the aristocratic party in the colony.

From this time till the American Revolution New York continued a province of the crown. Royal governor succeeded royal governor, some of

them better, some worse. Of the entire line Bellomont was the most worthy official, Cornbury the least so. One of the problems which chiefly worried all of them was how to execute the navigation acts, which, evaded everywhere, were here unscrupulously defied. Another care of the governors, in which they succeeded but very imperfectly, was to establish the English Church in the colony. A third was the disfranchisement of Catholics. This they accomplished, the legislature concurring, and the disability continued during the entire colonial period.

Hottest struggle of all occurred over the question of the colony's right of self-taxation. The democracy stood for this with the utmost firmness, and even the higher classes favored rather than opposed. The governors, Cornbury and Lovelace, most frantically, but in vain, expostulated, scolded, threatened, till at last it became admitted by law in the colony that no tax whatever could, on any pretext, be levied save by act of the people's representatives.

Dutch America, it will be remembered, had reached southward to the Delaware River, and this lower portion passed with the rest to the Duke of York in 1664. The territory between the Hudson and the Delaware, under the name of New Jersey, he made over to Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret, proprietaries, who favored the freest institutions, civil and religious. The population was for long very sparse and, as it grew, very miscellaneous. Dutch, Swedes, English, Quakers, and Puritans from New England were represented.

After the English recovery Berkeley disposed of his undivided half of the province, subsequently set off as West Jersey, to one Bylling, a Quaker, who in a little time assigned it to Lawrie, Lucas, Penn, and other Quakers. West Jersey became as much a Quaker paradise as Pennsylvania. Penn, with eleven of his brethren, also bought, of Carteret's heirs, East Jersey, but here Puritan rather than Quaker influence prevailed.

The Jersey plantations came of course under Andros, and after his fall its proprietors did not recover their political authority. For twelve years, while they were endeavoring to do this, partial anarchy cursed the province, and at length in 1702 they surrendered their rights to the crown, the Jerseys, now made one, becoming directly subject to Queen Anne. The province had its own legislature and, till 1741, the same governors as New York. It also had mainly the same political vicissitudes, and with the same result.

William Penn, the famous Quaker, received the proprietorship of Pennsylvania in payment of a claim for sixteen thousand pounds against the English Government. This had been left him by his father, Sir William Penn, a distinguished naval commander in the Dutch war of 1665-67, when he had borne chief part in the conquest of Jamaica.

William Penn was among the most cultivated men of his time, polished by study and travel, deeply read in law and philosophy. He had fortune, and many friends at court, including Charles II. himself. He needed but to conform, and great place was his. But conform he would not. True

to the inner light, braving the scoffs of all his friends, expelled from Oxford University, beaten from his own father's door, imprisoned now nine months in London Tower, now six in Newgate, this heroic spirit persistently went the Quaker way. In despair of securing in England freedom for distressed consciences he turned his thoughts toward America, there to try his "holy experiment."

The charter from Charles II. was drawn by Penn's own hand and was nobly liberal. It ordained perfect religious toleration for all Christians, and forbade taxation save by the provincial assembly or the English Parliament. Under William and Mary, greatly to his grief, Penn was forced to sanction the penal laws against Catholics; but they were most leniently administered, which brought upon the large-minded proprietary much trouble with the home government.

As Pennsylvania, owing to the righteous and loving procedure of Penn toward them, suffered nothing from the red men to the west, so was it fortunately beyond Andros's jurisdiction on the east. Once, from 1692, for two years, the land was snatched from Penn and placed under a royal commission. Returning to England in 1684, after a two years' sojourn in America to get his colony started, the Quaker chief became intimate and a favorite with James II., devotedly supporting his Declaration of Indulgence toward Catholics as well as toward all Protestant dissenters. He tried hard but vainly to win William and Mary to the same policy. This attitude of his cost him dear, rendering him an object of suspicion to the men

now in power in England. Twice was he accused of treasonable correspondence with the exiled James II., though never proved guilty. From 1699 to 1701 he was in America again, thereafter residing in England till his death in 1718. He had literally given all for his colony, his efforts on its behalf having been to him, so he wrote in 1710, a cause of grief, trouble, and poverty.

But the colony itself was amazingly prosperous. There were internal feuds, mainly petty, some serious. George Keith grievously divided the Quakers by his teachings against slavery, going to law, or service as magistrates on the part of Quakers, thus implying that only infidels or churchmen could be the colony's officials.

Fletcher's governorship in 1693-94, under the royal commission, evoked continual opposition, colonial privileges remaining intact in spite of him. The people from time to time subjected their ground-law to changes, only to render it a fitter instrument of freedom. In everything save the hereditary function of the proprietary, it was democratic. For many years even the governor's council was elective. The colony grew, immigrants crowding in from nearly every European country, and wealth multiplied to correspond.

We have, dating from 1698, a history of Pennsylvania by one Gabriel Thomas, full of interesting information. Philadelphia was already a "noble and beautiful city," containing above 2,000 houses, most of them "stately," made of brick; three stores, and besides a town house, a market house, and several schools. Three fairs were held

there yearly, and two weekly markets, which it required twenty fat bullocks, besides many sheep, calves, and hogs to supply. The city had large trade to New York, New England, Virginia, West India, and Old England. Its exports were horses, pipe-staves, salt meats, bread-stuffs, poultry, and tobacco; its imports fir, rum, sugar, molasses, silver, negroes, salt, linen, household goods, etc. Wages were three times as high as in England or Wales. All sorts of "very good paper" were made at Germantown, besides linen, druggets, crapes, camplets, serges, and other woollen cloths. All religious confessions were represented.

In 1712, such his poverty, the good proprietary was willing to sell to the crown, but as he insisted upon maintenance of the colonists' full rights, no sale occurred. English bigots and revenue officials would gladly have annulled his charter, but his integrity had gotten him influence among English statesmen, which shielded the heritage he had left even when he was gone.

It is particularly to be noticed that till our Independence Delaware was most intimately related to Pennsylvania. Of Delaware the fee simple belonged not to Penn but to the Duke of York, who had conquered it from the Dutch, as they from the Swedes. Penn therefore governed here, not as proprietary but as the Duke's tenant. In 1690-92, and from 1702, Delaware enjoyed a legislature by itself, though its governors were appointed by Penn or his heirs during the entire colonial period.

## CHAPTER V.

### MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, CAROLINA

THE establishment of Charles II. as king fully restored Lord Baltimore as proprietary in Maryland, and for a long time the colony enjoyed much peace and prosperity. In 1660 it boasted twelve thousand inhabitants, in 1665 sixteen thousand, in 1676 twenty thousand. Plantation life was universal, there being no town worthy the name till Baltimore, which, laid out in 1739, grew very slowly. Tobacco was the main production, too nearly the only one, the planters sometimes actually suffering for food, so that the raising of cereals needed to be enforced by law. For long the weed was also the money of the province, not disused for this even when paper currency was introduced, being found the less fluctuating in value of the two. Partly actual over-production and partly the navigation acts, forcing all sales to be effected through England, fatally lowered the price, and Maryland with Virginia tried to establish a "trust" to regulate the output.

In its incessant and on one occasion bloody boundary disputes with Pennsylvania and Delaware, Maryland had to give in and suffer its northern and eastern boundaries to be shortened.



One of the most beautiful traits of early Maryland was its perfect toleration in religion. Practically neither Pennsylvania nor Rhode Island surpassed it in this. Much hostility to the Quakers existed, yet they had here exceptional privileges, and great numbers from Virginia and the North utilized these. All sorts of dissenters indeed flocked hither out of all European countries, including many Huguenots, and were made welcome to all the rights and blessings of the land.

But from the accession of Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore, in 1675, the colony witnessed continual agitation in favor of establishing the English Church. False word reached the Privy Council that immorality was rife in the colony owing to a lack of religious instruction, and that Catholics were preferred in its offices. This movement succeeded, in spite of its intrinsic demerit, by passing itself off as part of the rising in favor of William and Mary in 1688-89.

James II. had shown no favor to Maryland. If its proprietary, as a Catholic, pleased him, its civil and religious liberty offended him more. He was hence not popular here, and the Marylanders would readily have proclaimed the new monarchs but for the accidental failure of the Proprietary's commands to this effect to reach them. This gave occasion for one Coode, with a few abettors, to form, in April, 1689, an "Association in Arms for the Defence of the Protestant Religion, and for Asserting the Right of King William and Queen Mary to the Province of Maryland." The exaggerated representations of these conspirators prevailed in

England. The proprietary, retaining his quit rents and export duty, was deprived of his political prerogatives. Maryland became a crown province, Sir Lionel Copley being the first royal governor, and the Church of England received establishment therein.

The new ecclesiastical rule did not oppress Protestant dissenters, though very severe on Catholics, whom it was supposed necessary, here as all over America, to keep under, lest they should rise in favor of James II., or his son the Pretender.

The third Lord Baltimore died in 1714-15. The proprietaries, after this being Protestants, were entrusted again with their old political headship. By this time a spirit of independence and self-assertion had grown up among the citizens, enforcing very liberal laws, and the vices of the sixth Lord, succeeding in 1751, made his subjects more than willing that he should, as he did, close the proprietary line.

Virginia, passionately loyal, at first gloried in the Restoration. This proved premature. It was found that the purely selfish Charles II. cared no more for Virginia than for Massachusetts. The Commonwealth's men were displaced from power. Sir William Berkeley again became governor, this time, however, by the authority of the assembly. A larger feeling of independence from England had sprung up in the colony in consequence of recent history at home and in the mother-land. It was developed still further by the events now to be detailed.

The Old Dominion contained at this time 40,-

000 people, 6,000 being white servants and 2,000 negro slaves, located mainly upon the lower waters of the Rappahannock, York, and James Rivers. Between 1650 and 1670, through large immigration from the old country, the population had increased from 15,000 to 40,000, some of the first families of the State in subsequent times arriving at this juncture. About eighty ships of commerce came each year from Great Britain, besides many from New England. Virginia herself built no ships and owned few; but she could muster eight thousand horse, had driven the Indians far into the interior, possessed the capacity for boundless wealth, and had begun to experience a decided sense of her own rights and importance. The last fact showed itself in Bacon's Rebellion, which broke out in 1676, just one hundred years before the Declaration of Independence. The causes of the insurrection were not far to seek.

The navigation acts were a sore grievance to Virginia as to the other colonies. Under Cromwell they had not been much enforced, and the Virginians had traded freely with all who came. Charles enforced them with all possible rigor, confining Virginia's trade to England and English ships manned by Englishmen. This gave England a grinding monopoly of tobacco, Virginia's sole export, making the planters commercially the slaves of the home government and of English traders. Duties on the weed were high, and mercilessly collected without regard to lowness of price. All supplies from abroad also had to be purchased in England, at prices set by English

sellers. Even if from other parts of Europe, they must come through England, thus securing her a profit at Virginia's expense.

This was not the worst. The colonial government had always been abused for the ends of worthless office-holders from England. Now it was farmed out more offensively than ever. In 1673 Charles II. donated Virginia to two of his favorites, Lords Arlington and Culpeper, to be its proprietaries like Penn in Pennsylvania and Baltimore in Maryland. They were to have all the quit rents and other revenues, the nomination of ministers for parishes, the right of appointing public officers, the right to own and sell all public or escheated lands: in a word, they now owned Virginia. This shabby treatment, awoke the most intense rage in so proud a people. The king relented, revoked his donation, made out and was about to send a new charter. But it was too late: rebellion had already broken out.

The Indians having made some attacks on the upper plantations, one Nathaniel Bacon, a spirited young gentleman of twenty-eight, recently from England, applied to Sir William Berkeley for a commission against them. The Governor declined to give it, fearing, in the present excited condition of the colony, to have a body of armed men abroad. Bacon, enraged, extorts the commission by force. The result is civil war in the colony. The rebels are for a time completely victorious. Berkeley is driven to Accomac, on the eastern shore of the Chesapeake, but, succeeding in capturing a fleet sent to oppose him, he returns with this and captures

Jamestown. Beaten by Bacon in a pitched battle, he again retires to Accomac and the colony comes fully under the power of his antagonist, the colonists agreeing even to fight England should it interpose on the governor's side, when a decisive change in affairs is brought about by the rebel leader's death.

The rebellion was now easily subdued, but it had soured and hardened old Governor Berkeley's spirit. Twenty-three in all were executed for participation in the movement. Charles II. remarked: "That old fool has hanged more men in that naked country than I for the murder of my father."

After Bacon's Rebellion the colonial annals show but a dull succession of royal governors, with few events specially interesting. Under the governorship of Lord Howard of Effingham, which began in 1684, great excitement prevailed in Virginia lest King James II. should subvert the English Church there and make Catholicism dominant, which indeed might possibly have occurred but for James's abdication in 1688.

Under Governor Nicholson, from 1690, the capital was removed from Jamestown to Williamsburg, and the College of William and Mary founded, its charter dating from 1693. The Attorney-General, Seymour, opposed this project on the ground that the money was needed for "better purposes" than educating clergymen. Rev. Dr. Blair, agent and advocate of the endowment, pleading: "The people have souls to be saved," Seymour retorted: "Damn your souls, make tobacco." But Blair

persisted and succeeded, himself becoming first president of the college. The initial commencement exercises took place in 1700.

Governor Spotswood, who came in 1710, did much for Virginia. He built the first iron furnaces in America, introduced wine-culture, for which he imported skilled Germans, and greatly interested himself in the civilization of the Indians. He was the earliest to explore the Shenandoah Valley. It was also by his energy that the famous pirate "Blackbeard" was captured and executed. Lieutenant Maynard, sent with two ships to hunt him, attacked and boarded the pirate vessel in Pamlico Sound, 1718. A tough fight at close quarters ensued. Blackbeard was shot dead, his crew crying for quarter. Thirteen of the men were hung at Williamsburg. Blackbeard's skull, made into a drinking-cup, is preserved to this day. The great corsair's fate, Benjamin Franklin, then a printer's devil in Boston, celebrated in verse.

Carolina was settled partly from England, France, and the Barbadoes, and partly from New England; but mainly from Virginia, which colony furthermore furnished most of its political ideas.

In March, 1663, Carolina was constituted a territory, extending from 36° north latitude southward to the river San Matheo, and assigned to a company of seven distinguished proprietaries, including General Monk, who had been created Duke of Albemarle, and John Locke's patron, the famous Lord Ashley Cooper, subsequently Earl of

Shaftesbury. Governor Sir William Berkeley, of Virginia, was also one of the proprietaries.

Locke drew up for the province a minute feudal constitution, but it was too cumbersome to work. Rule by the proprietaries proved radically bad. They were ignorant, callous to wrongs done by their governors, and indifferent to everything save their own profits. Many of the settlers too were turbulent and criminals, fugitives from the justice of other colonies. The difficulty was aggravated by Indian and Spanish wars, by negro slavery, so profitable for rice culture, especially in South Carolina, by strife between dissenters and churchmen, by the question of revenue, and by that of representation.

A proprietary party and a larger popular party were continually at feud, not seldom with arms, support of the Church allying itself mainly with the former, dissent with the latter. Zealots for the Church wished to exclude dissenters from the assembly. Their opponents would keep Huguenot immigrants, whom the favor of the proprietaries rendered unwelcome, entirely from the franchise. The popular party passed laws for electing representatives in every county instead of at Charleston alone, and for revenue tariffs to pay the debt entailed by war. The proprietaries vetoed both. They even favored the pirates who harried the coast. Civil commotions were frequent and growth slow. Interference by the crown was therefore most happy. From the time the Carolinas passed into royal hands, 1729, remarkable prosperity attended them both.

Assuming charge of Carolina, the Crown reserved to itself the Spanish frontier, and here, in 1732, it settled Oglethorpe, the able and unselfish founder of Georgia, under the auspices of an organization in form much like a mercantile company, but benevolent in aim, whose main purpose was to open a home for the thousands of Englishmen who were in prison for debt. Many Scotch and many Austrians also came. Full civil liberty was promised to all, religious liberty to all but papists. Political strife was warm here, too, particularly respecting the admission of rum and slaves. Government by the corporators, though well-meaning, was ill-informed and a failure, and would have been ruinous to the colony but for Oglethorpe's genius and exertions. To the advantage of all, therefore, on the lapse of the charter in 1752, Georgia, like the Carolinas, assumed the status of a royal colony.



## CHAPTER VI.

### GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE COLONIES

THE political life, habits, and forms familiar to our fathers were such as their peculiar surroundings and experience had developed out of English originals. This process and its results form an interesting study.

The political unit at the South was the parish; in the North it was the town. Jury trial prevailed in all the colonies. Local self-government was vigorous everywhere, yet the most so in the North. The town regulated its affairs, such as the schools, police, roads, the public lands, the poor, and in Massachusetts and Connecticut also religion, at first by pure mass meetings where each citizen represented himself and which were both legislative and judicial in function, then by combining these meetings in various ways with the agency of selectmen. Where and so soon as a colony came to embrace several towns, representative machinery was set in motion and a colonial legislature formed, having two chambers nearly everywhere, like Parliament. The county, with the same character as at present, was instituted later than the oldest towns and parishes, but itself subsequently became, in thinly settled parts, the unit of governmental

organization and political action, being divided into towns or parishes only gradually. Voting was subject to a property qualification, in some colonies to a religious one also ; but no nobility of blood or title got foothold.

The relation of the colonial governments to England is a far more perplexing matter. From the preceding chapters it appears that we may distinguish the colonies, if we come down to about 1750, as either (1) self-governing or charter colonies, in which liberty was most complete and subjection to England little more than nominal, and (2) non-self-governing, ruled, theoretically at any rate, in considerable measure from outside themselves. Rhode Island and Connecticut made up the former class. Of the latter there were two groups, the royal or provincial, including New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, and the proprietary, viz., Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware.

Yet we are to bear in mind that many important constitutional and governmental changes had occurred by 1750. Massachusetts, as we have seen, had ceased to be self-governing as at first, yet it retained a charter which conferred large liberty. All the provincial colonies began as proprietary, and all the proprietary were for a time provincial.

Under Andros, New England stretched from the St. Croix to Delaware Bay. After 1689 the tendency in all parts of the country was strong toward civil freedom, which, favored by the changes and apathy of proprietaries and the ignorance and quarrels of the English ministry, gradually rendered

the other colonies in effect about as well off in this respect as Rhode Island and Connecticut.

But unfortunately the legal limits and meaning of this freedom were never determined. Had they been, our Revolution need not have come. Monarchs continually attempted to stretch hither the royal prerogative, but how far this was legal was not then, and never can be, decided. The constitutional scope of a monarch's prerogative in England itself was one of the great questions of the seventeenth century, and remained serious and unsettled through the eighteenth. Applied to America the problem became angrier still, partly because giving a charter—and the colonies were all founded on such gift—was an act of prerogative.

English lawyers never doubted that acts of Parliament were valid in the colonies. The colonists opposed both the king's and the Parliament's pretensions, and held their own legislatures to be co-ordinate with the Houses at Westminster. They claimed *as rights* the protection of *habeas corpus*, freedom from taxation without their consent, and all the great charter's guarantees. It was the habit of English theorizing on the subject to allow them these, if at all, as of grace. Repudiating the pretense that they were represented in Parliament, they likewise denied all wish to be so, but desired to have colonial legislatures recognized as concurrent with the English—each colony joined to the mother-country by a sort of personal union, or through some such tie as exists between England and her colonies to-day. Massachusetts theorists used as a valid analogy the relation of ancient Nor-

mandy to the French kings. Though no longer venturing to do so at home, monarchs freely vetoed legislation in all the colonies except Rhode Island and Connecticut. It was held that even these colonies were after all somehow subject to England's oversight.

On the subject of taxation there was continual dispute, misunderstanding, recrimination. The colonies did not object to providing for their own defence. They were willing to do this under English direction if asked, not commanded. Direct taxation for England's behoof was never once consented to by America, and till late never thought of by England. The English navigation laws, however, though amounting to taxation of America in aid of England, and continually evaded as unjust, were allowed by the colonies' legislative acts, and never seriously objected to in any formal way.

## CHAPTER VII.

### SOCIAL CULTURE IN COLONIAL TIMES

AMERICAN society rose out of mere untitled humanity ; monarchy, guilds, priests, and all aristocracy of a feudal nature having been left behind in Europe. The year 1700 found in all the American colonies together some 300,000 people. They were distributed about as follows : New England had 115,000 ; New York, 30,000 ; New Jersey, 15,000 ; Pennsylvania and Delaware, 20,000 ; Maryland, 35,000 ; Virginia, 70,000 ; the Carolina country, 15,000. Perhaps 50,000 were negro slaves, of whom, say, 10,000 were held north of Mason and Dixon's line. What is now New York City had, in 1697, 4,302 inhabitants.

Passing on to 1754, we find the white population of New England increased to 425,000 ; that of the middle colonies, including Maryland, to 457,000 ; that of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia to 283,000. Massachusetts alone now had 207,000 ; Rhode Island, 35,000 ; Connecticut, 133,000 ; New York State (1756), 83,744. There were now not far from 263,000 negroes, of whom 14,000 lived in New England, 4,500 in Rhode Island. The total population of the thirteen colonies amounted to nearly a million and a half. At this

time Philadelphia about equalled Boston in size, each having 25,000 inhabitants. At the Revolution Boston had grown to be the larger. New York, with from 15,000 to 18,000, constituted the centre of trade and of politics. The city and county of New York together numbered 13,046 inhabitants in 1756; 21,862 in 1771; 23,614 in 1786. The whole State, in 1771, had 146,144. Connecticut, in 1774, had 197,856. There are said to have been, so late as 1763, woods where the New York City Hall now stands.

From North to South the population decreased in density, but it increased in heterogeneity and non-English elements, and in illiteracy. The South had also the stronger aristocratic feeling. Slaves, as the above figures show, were far more numerous in that section. Their condition was also worse there.

A large proportion of the white population everywhere was of Saxon-Teutonic blood. The colonial leaders, and many others, at least in the North, were men who would have been eminent in England itself. Not a few New England theologians and lawyers were peers to the ablest of their time. Numbers of the common people read, reflected, debated. While profoundly religious, the colonists, being nearly all Protestants, were bold and progressive thinkers in every line, prizing discussion, preferring to settle questions by rational methods rather than through authority and tradition. We have observed that there are exceptions to this rule, like the treatment of Roger Williams, but they were exceptions. The colonists pos-

sessed in eminent degree energy, determination, power of patient endurance and sacrifice. Their political genius, too, was striking in itself, and it becomes surprising if one compares Germany, in the unspeakable distraction of the 'Thirty Years' War, with America at the same period, 1618-1648, successfully solving by patience and debate the very problems which were Germany's despair.

In all the southern colonies the English Church was established, a majority of the people its members, its clergy supported by tithes and glebe. William and Mary secured it a sort of establishment also in New York and Maryland. Yet at no moment of the colonial period was there a bishop in America. No church building was consecrated with episcopal rites, no resident of America taken into orders without going to London.\* Even in Virginia, till a very late colonial period, the clergy retained many Puritan forms. Some would not read the Common Prayer. For more than a hundred years the surplice was apparently unknown there, sacraments administered without the proper ornaments and vessels, parts of the liturgy omitted, marriages, baptisms, churchings, and funerals solemnized in private houses. In some parishes, so late as 1724, the communion was partaken sitting. Excellent as were many of the clergymen, there were some who never preached, and not a few even bore an ill name. It was worst in Maryland, and "bad as a Maryland parson" became a proverb. The yearly salary in the best Virginia parishes was tobacco of about £100 value.

\* See, for these facts, *The Century* for May, 1888.

The Carolina clergy at first formed a superior class, as nearly all the early ministers were men carefully selected and sent out from England by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Here there was special interest in the religious welfare of the slaves. All over the South the Church ministers owed much to competition with those of sects, especially those of the Presbyterians, to which body belonged many of the Scotch and Irish immigrants after 1700. Dissent was dominant everywhere at the North. A vast majority of the people even in New York were dissenters, though the Episcopal clergy there successfully resisted all efforts against the Church tax, notwithstanding the fact that the same injustice in Massachusetts and Connecticut oppressed their brethren in those colonies. The New York clergy also fought every sort of liberal law, as to enable dissenting bodies of Christians to hold property. It was in good degree this attitude of theirs that filled the country, Virginia too, with such hatred of bishops.

But this spirit was fully matched by that of the Independent ministers in New England. Their dissent was aggressive, persecuting, puritanical. Meeting-houses were cold, sermons long and dry, music vocal only. Religious teaching and the laws it procured, foolishly assumed to regulate all the acts of life. Extravagance was denounced and fined. In 1750, the Massachusetts Assembly forbade theatres as "likely to encourage immorality and impiety." Rhode Island took similar action in 1762.

The ministers of Boston viewed bishops almost



as emissaries of the devil. Herein in fact lay the primary, some have thought the deepest and most potent, cause of the Revolution, since kings and the bishops of London incessantly sought to establish Anglicanism in Massachusetts, and English politicians deemed it outrageous that conformists should be denied any of that colony's privileges. For some time, under William and Mary's charter, in this province where Congregationalism had till now had everything its own way, only Church clergymen could celebrate marriage. In New York and Maryland, too, hostility to the establishment greatly stimulated disloyalty. This was true even in Anglican Virginia, where the Church found it no casier to keep power than it was in Massachusetts to get power, and where the clergy were unpopular, concerned more for tithes than for souls.

Colleges were founded early in several colonies. Harvard dates from 1638; William and Mary, in Virginia, from 1693; Yale, from 1701; the College of New Jersey from 1746, its old Nassau Hall, built in 1756 and named in honor of William III. of the House of Nassau, being then the largest structure in British America. The University of Pennsylvania dates from 1753; King's College, now Columbia, from 1754; Rhode Island College, now Brown University, from 1764. Educational facilities in general varied greatly with sections, being miserable in the southern colonies, fair in the central, excellent in the northern. In Virginia, during the period now under our survey, schools were almost unknown. In Maryland, from 1728, a free

school was established by law in each county. These were the only such schools in the South before 1770. Philadelphia and New York had good schools by 1700, rural Pennsylvania none of any sort till 1750, then only the poorest. A few New York and New Jersey towns of New England origin had free schools before the Revolution. Many Southern planters sent their sons to school in England. In popular education New England led not only the continent but the world, there being a school-house, often several, in each town. Every native adult in Massachusetts and Connecticut was able to read and write. In this matter Rhode Island was far behind its next neighbors.

Newspapers were distributed much as schools were. The first printing-press was set up at Cambridge in 1639. The first newspaper, *Publick Occurrences Foreign and Domestic*, was started in Boston in 1690. The first permanent newspaper, the *Boston News Letter*, began in 1704, and it had a Boston and a Philadelphia rival in 1719. The *Maryland Gazette* was started at Annapolis in 1727, a weekly at Williamsburg, Va., in 1736. In 1740 there were eleven newspapers in all in the colonies: one each in New York, South Carolina, and Virginia (from 1736), three in Pennsylvania, one of them German, and five in Boston. The *Connecticut Gazette* was started at New Haven in 1755; *The Summary*, at New London, in 1758. The *Rhode Island Gazette* was begun by James Franklin, September 27, 1732, but was not permanent. The *Providence Gazette and Country Journal* put forth its first issue October 20, 1762. In 1775, Salem, Newburyport, and

Portsmouth had each its newspaper. The first daily in the country, the *Pennsylvania Packet*, began in 1784.

Other literature of American origin flourished in New England nearly alone. It consisted of sermons, social and political tracts, poetry, history, and memoirs. The clergy were the chief but not the sole authors. Of readers, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston had many. Much reading matter came from England. Charleston enjoyed a public library from 1700. About 1750 there were several others. That left to Philadelphia in 1751, by James Logan, comprised 4,000 volumes.

William and Mary had established a postal system for America, placing Thomas Neale, Esquire, at its head. The service hardly became a system till 1738. In ordinary weather a post-rider would receive the Philadelphia mail at the Susquehanna River on Saturday evening, be at Annapolis on Monday, reach the Potomac Tuesday night, on Wednesday arrive at New Post, near Fredericksburg, and by Saturday evening at Williamsburg, whence, once a month, the mail went still farther south, to Edenton, N. C. Thus a letter was just a week in transit between Philadelphia and the capital of Virginia. In New England, from here to New York, and between New York and Philadelphia, despatch was much better.

The learned professions also were best patronized and had the ablest *personnel* in New England, where all three, but particularly the clergy, were strong and honored. Outside of New England, till 1750, lawyers and physicians, especially in the

country parts, were poorly educated and little respected. Each formidable disease had the people at its mercy. Diphtheria, then known as the throat disease, swept through the land once in about thirty years. Small-pox was another frequent scourge. In 1721 it attacked nearly six thousand persons in Boston, about half the population, killing some nine hundred. The clergy, almost to a man, decried vaccination when first vented, proclaiming it an effort to thwart God's will. Clergymen, except perhaps in Carolina and Virginia, were somewhat better educated, yet those in New England led all others in this respect.

Colonial America boasted many great intellectual lights. President Edwards won European reputation as a thinker, and so did Franklin as a statesman and as a scientist. Linnæus named our Bartram, a Quaker farmer of Pennsylvania, the greatest natural botanist then living. Increase Mather read and wrote both Greek and Hebrew, and spoke Latin. He and his son Cotton were veritable wonders in literary attainment. The one was the author of ninety-two books, the other of three hundred and eighty-three. The younger Winthrop was a member of the Royal Society. Copley, Stuart, and West became distinguished painters.

Except for mails, there were in the colonies no public conveyances by land till just before the Revolution. After stage lines were introduced, to go from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh required seven days; from Philadelphia to New York at first three, later two. The earliest coach to attain the

last-named speed was advertised as "the flying machine." From Boston one would be four days travelling to New York, two to Portsmouth. Packet-boats between the main points on the coast were as regular and speedy as wind allowed. Stage-drivers, inn-keepers, and ship-captains were the honored and accredited purveyors of news.

Everywhere was great prosperity, little luxury. Paucity of money gave rise to that habit of barter and dicker in trade which was a mannerism of our fathers. Agriculture formed the basal industry, especially in the Southern colonies; yet in New England and Pennsylvania both manufactures and commerce thrived. Pennsylvania's yearly foreign commerce exceeded 1,000,000 pounds sterling, requiring 500 vessels and more than 7,000 seamen. From Pennsylvania, in 1750, 3,000 tons of pig-iron were exported. The annual production of iron in Maryland just before the Revolution reached 25,000 tons of pig, 500 of bar. The business of marine insurance began in this country at Philadelphia in 1721, fire insurance at Boston in 1724. New England produced timber, ships, rum, paper, hats, leather, and linen and woollen cloths, the first three for export.

In country places houses were poor save on the great estates, south, but in the cities there were many fine mansions before 1700. From this year stoves began to be used. Glass windows and paper hangings were first seen not far from 1750.

The colonists ate much flesh, and nearly all used tobacco and liquor freely. Finest ladies snuffed, sometimes smoked. Little coffee was drunk, and

no tea till about 1700. Urban life was social and gay. In the country the games of fox and geese, three and twelve men morris, husking bees and quilting bees were the chief sports. Tableware was mostly of wood, though many had pewter, and the rich much silver. The people's ordinary dress was of home-made cloth, but not a few country people still wore deerskin. The clothing of the rich was imported, and often gaudy with tasteless ornament. Wigs were common in the eighteenth century, and all head-dress stupidly elaborate.

William Lang, of Boston, advertises in 1767 to provide all who wish with wigs "in the most genteel and polite taste," assuring judges, divines, lawyers, and physicians, "because of the importance of their heads, that he can assort his wigs to suit their respective occupations and inclinations." He tells the ladies that he can furnish anyone of them with "a nice, easy, genteel, and polite construction of rolls, such as may tend to raise their heads to any pitch they desire."

"Everybody wore wigs in 1750, except convicts and slaves. Boys wore them, servants wore them, Quakers wore them, paupers wore them. The making of wigs was an important branch of industry in Great Britain. Wigs were of many styles and prices. Some dangled with curls; and they were designated by a great variety of names, such as tyes, bobs, majors, spencers, foptails, twists, tetes, scratches, full-bottomed dress bobs, cues, and perukes. The people of Philadelphia dressed as the actors of our theatres now dress in old English com-

edy. They walked the streets in bright-colored and highly decorated coats, three-cornered hats, ruffled shirts and wrist-bands, knee-breeches, silk stockings, low shoes, and silver buckles."\* Lord Stirling, one of Washington's generals, had a clothing inventory like a king: a "pompidou" cloth coat and vest, breeches with gold lace, a crimson and figured velvet coat, seven scarlet vests, *et cetera*, *et cetera*.

The wigs encountered the zealous hostility of many, among these Judge Samuel Sewall. His highest eulogy on a departed worthy was: "The welfare of the poor was much upon his spirit and he abominated periwigs." A member of the church at Newbury, Mass., refused to attend communion because the pastor wore a wig, believing that all who were guilty of this practice would be damned if they did not repent. A meeting of Massachusetts Quakers solemnly expressed the conviction that the wearing of extravagant and superfluous wigs was wholly contrary to the truth.

There was an aristocracy, of its kind, in all the colonies, but it was far the strongest in the South. Social lines were sharply drawn, an "Esquire" not liking to be accosted as "Mr.," and each looking down somewhat upon a simple "Goodman." These gradations stood forth in college catalogues and in the location of pews in churches. The Yale triennial catalogue until 1767 and the Harvard triennial till 1772 arrange students' names not alphabetically or according to attainments, but so as to indicate

\* Mrs. M. J. Lamb, in *Magazine of Am. History*, August, 1888.

the social rank of their families. Memoranda of President Clap, of Yale, against the names of youth when admitted to college, such as "Justice of the Peace," "Deacon," "of middling estate much impoverished," reveal how hard it sometimes was properly to grade students socially. At the South, regular mechanics, like all free laborers, were few and despised. The indentured servants, very numerous in several colonies, differed little from slaves. David Jamieson, attorney-general of New York in 1710, had been banished from Scotland as a Covenanter and sold in New Jersey as a four years redemptioner to pay transportation expenses. Such servants were continually running away, which may have aided in abolishing the system. Paupers and criminals were fewest in New England. All the colonies imprisoned insolvent criminals, though dirt and damp made each prison a hell. All felonies were awarded capital punishment, and many minor crimes incurred barbarous penalties. Whipping - post, pillory, and stocks were in frequent use. So late as 1760 women were publicly whipped. At Hartford, in 1761, David Campbell and Alexander Pettigrew, for the burglary of two watches, received each fifteen stripes, the loss of the right ear, and the brand-mark "B" on the forehead. Pettigrew came near losing his life from the profuse bleeding which ensued. A husband killing his wife was hanged. A wife killing her husband was burned, as were slaves who slew their masters.

In care for the unfortunate and in the study and in all applications of social science, Philadelphia



led. The Pennsylvania Hospital, the first institution of the kind in America, was founded in 1751. The Philadelphia streets were the first to be lighted; those of New York next; those of Boston not till 1773. Before the end of the period now before us Philadelphia and New York also had night patrols.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### ENGLAND AND FRANCE IN AMERICA

WORKING upward from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the source of this and of the Mississippi, and then down the latter river, Franciscans and Jesuits their pioneers, braving dreadful hardships and dangers in efforts, more courageous than successful, to convert the Indians, the French had come to control that great continental highway and boldly to claim for France the entire heart of North America.

In 1659, Groseilliers and Radisson penetrated beyond Lake Superior, and dwelt for a time among the Sioux, who knew of the Mississippi River. Next year Groseilliers went thither again, accompanied by the Jesuit Menard and his servant, Guérin. In 1661 Menard and Guérin pushed into what is now Wisconsin, and may have seen the Mississippi. These explorations made the French familiar with the copper mines of Lake Superior, and awakened the utmost zeal to see the Great River of which the Indians spoke. La Salle probably discovered the Ohio in 1670, and traced it down to the falls at Louisville. His main eulogist holds that he even reached the Mississippi at that time, some three years earlier than

Joliet, but this is not substantiated. We also reject the belief that he reached the stream by way of the Chicago portage in 1671.

In 1672 Count Frontenac, Governor of New France, despatched Louis Joliet to discover the Great River. He reached the Strait of Mackinaw in December, and there Père Marquette joined him. In May, next year, they paddled their canoes up the Fox River and tugged them across the portage into the Wisconsin, which they descended, entering the Father of Waters June 17, 1673. They floated down to the mouth of the Arkansas and then returned, their journey back being up the Illinois and Desplaines Rivers. Joliet gave his name to the peak on the latter stream which the city of Joliet, Ill., near by, still retains. Joliet arrived at Quebec in August, 1674, having in four months journeyed over twenty-five hundred miles.

It thus became known how close the upper waters of the great rivers, St. Lawrence and Mississippi, were to each other, and that the latter emptied into the Gulf of Mexico instead of the South Sea (Pacific); yet, as the Rocky Mountains had not then been discovered, it was for long believed that some of the western tributaries of the Great River led to that western ocean.

In 1676 Raudin, and three years later, Du Lhut, visited the Ojibwas and Sioux west of Lake Superior. Du Lhut reached the upper waters of the Mississippi at Sandy Lake. He went there again in 1680. In 1682 La Salle crossed the Chicago portage and explored the lower Mississippi

all the way to the Gulf, taking possession of the entire valley in the name of France and naming it Louisiana. Nicholas Perrot travelled by way of the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers to the upper Mississippi in 1685, and again in 1688. It is in his writings that the word "Chicago" first appears in literature.

There were thus between the two great valleys, 1, the Superior route; 2, the Wisconsin and Fox route; 3, the Illinois River route, whether by the Kankakee, La Salle's way, or by the south branch of the Chicago River, Joliet's way; and 4, the route by the Wabash and Ohio. The Wabash, too, could be approached either from Lake Erie or from Lake Michigan, through St. Joseph's River. At high water, canoes often passed from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi without portage.

La Salle had the ambition to get to the South Sea from the Mississippi. Governor De la Barre, who followed Frontenac, opposing him, he repaired to France, where he succeeded in winning Louis XIV. to his plan. At the head of a well-equipped fleet he sailed for the mouth of the Mississippi, reaching land near Matagorda Bay on the first day of the year 1685. Not finding the Mississippi, La Salle's officers mutinied. The expedition broke up into parties, wandering here and there, distressed by Indian attacks and by treachery among themselves. La Salle was shot by his own men. Nearly all his followers perished, but a small party at last discovered the river and ascended it to Fort St. Louis on the Illinois, reach-

ing France *via* Quebec. In this expedition France took possession of Texas, nor did she ever relinquish the claim till, in 1763, the whole of Louisiana west of the Mississippi was ceded to Spain. La Salle's ill-starred attempt led later to the planting of French colonies by D'Iberville at Biloxi Island; in Mobile Bay, soon abandoned, and at Poverty Point, on the Mississippi; and still later to the settlement of New Orleans and vicinity. Growth in these parts was slow, however. So late as 1713 there were not over three hundred whites in the entire Mississippi Valley.

By this time French traders had set foot on every shore of the great lakes and explored nearly every stream tributary thereto. The English, pushing westward more and more, were trying to divide with them the lucrative business of fur-trading, and each nation sought to win to itself all the Indians it could. The Mohawks and their confederates of the Five Nations, now equipped and acquainted with fire-arms, spite of alternate overtures and threats from the French, remained firm friends to the English, who more and more invaded those vast and fertile western ranges. It grew to be the great question of the age this side the Atlantic, whether England or France should control the continent. King William's war, declared in 1689, was therefore certain to rage in America as well as in Europe.

One sees by a glance at the map what advantage France had in this struggle. It possessed the best fishing grounds and fur-producing districts, and fish and furs were at first the only exports of

value from the north of America. The French, too, held all the water-ways to the heart of the continent. Coming up Lake Champlain they could threaten New York and New England from the rear. The colonies farther south they shut in almost as straitly, French bullets whistling about any Englishman's ears the instant he appeared beyond the mountains.

In other respects England had the advantage. In population English America had become as superior as French America was territorially, having 1,116,000 white inhabitants in 1750, to about 80,000 French. The English colonies were also more convenient to the mother-country, and the better situated for commerce both coastwise and across the ocean. Among the English, temper for mere speculation and adventure decayed very early, giving way to the conviction that successful planting depended wholly upon persistent, energetic toil.

A piece of fortune more important yet was their relatively free religious and political system. Toleration in religion was large. Self-government was nearly complete internally, and indeed externally, till the navigation acts. Canada, on the other hand, was oppressed by a feudal constitution in the state, settlers being denied the fee simple of their lands, and by Jesuits in Church. "New France could not grow," says Parkman, "with a priest on guard at the gate to let in none but such as pleased him. In making Canada a citadel of the state religion, the clerical monitors of the crown robbed their country of a transatlantic empire." Thus the Hu-

guenots, France's best emigrants to America, did not come to New France, but to New England and the other Protestant colonies.

The Indian hostilities which heralded King William's War began August 13, 1688. Frontenac prepared to capture Albany and even Manhattan. He did not accomplish so much; but on the night of February 8, 1689-90, his force of ninety Iroquois and over 100 Frenchmen fell upon Schenectady, killed sixty, and captured eighty or ninety more. Only a corporal's guard escaped to Albany with the sad news. This attack had weighty influence, as occasioning the first American congress. Seven delegates from various colonies assembled at New York on May 1, 1690, to devise defence against the northern invaders.

The eastern Indians were hardly at rest from Philip's War when roused by the French to engage in this. An attack was made upon Haverhill, Mass., and Hannah Dustin, with a child only a few days old, another woman, and a boy, was led captive to an Indian camp up the Merrimac. The savages killed the infant, but thereby steeled the mother's heart for revenge. One night the three prisoners slew their sleeping guards and, seizing a canoe, floated down to their home. Dover was attacked June 27, 1689, twenty-three persons killed, and twenty-nine sold to the French in Canada. Indescribable horrors occurred at Oyster River, at Salmon Falls, at Casco, at Exeter, and elsewhere.

In 1702 Queen Anne's War began, and in this again New England was the chief sufferer. The barbarities which marked it were worse than those

of Philip's War. De Rouville, with a party of French and savages, proceeded from Canada to Deerfield, Mass. Fearing an attack, the villagers meant to be vigilant, but early on a February morning, 1704, the wily enemy, skulking till the sentinels retired at daylight, managed to effect a surprise.\* Fifty were killed and one hundred hurried off to Canada. Among these were the minister, Mr. Williams, and his family. Twenty years later a white woman in Indian dress entered Deerfield. It was one of the Williams daughters. She had married an Indian in Canada and now refused to desert him. Cases like this, of which there were many in the course of these frightful wars, seemed to the settlers harder to bear than death. Massachusetts came so to dread the atrocious foe that fifteen pounds were offered by public authority for an Indian man's scalp, eight for a child's or a woman's.

Governor Spotswood urged aggression on the French to the west, Governor Hunter of New York had equal zeal for a movement northward. New York raised 600 men and the same number of Iroquois, voting 10,000 pounds of paper money for their sustenance. Connecticut and New Jersey sent 1,600 men. A force of 4,000 in all mustered at Albany under Nicholson of New York. They were to co-operate against Montreal with the naval expedition of 1711, commanded by Sir Hoveden Walker. Walker failed ignominiously, and Nicholson, hearing of this betimes, saved himself by retreating.

Sir William Phips had captured Port Royal in



1690, and Acadia was annexed to Massachusetts in 1692. In 1691 the French again took formal possession of Port Royal and the neighboring country. In 1692 an ineffectual attempt was made to recover it, but by the Treaty of Ryswick, 1697, it was explicitly given back to France.

At the inception of Queen Anne's War, in 1702, there were several expeditions from New England to Nova Scotia; in 1704 and 1707 without result. That of 1710 was more successful. It consisted of four regiments and thirty-six vessels, besides troop and store ships and some marines. Port Royal capitulated and its name was changed to Annapolis, in honor of Queen Anne. Acadia never again came under French control, and was regularly ceded to England by the Treaty of Utrecht, 1713. Notwithstanding this, however, French America still remained substantially intact.

If the great struggle for the Ohio Valley now became a silent one, it was none the less earnest. Spotswood had opened a road across the Blue Ridge in 1716. In 1721 New Yorkers began settling on Oswego River, and they finished a fort there by 1726. Closer alliance was formed with the Five Nations. The French governor of Quebec in 1725 pleaded that Niagara must be fortified, and on his successor was urged the necessity of reducing the Oswego garrison. It was partly to flank Oswego that the French pushed up Lake Champlain to Crown Point and built Fort St. Frederick.

The Treaty of Utrecht had left Cape Breton Island to France. The French at once strongly

fortified Louisburg and invited thither the French inhabitants of Acadia and Newfoundland, which had also been ceded to Great Britain. Many went, though the British governors did much to hinder removal. This irritated the French authorities, and the Indian atrocities of 1723-24 at Dover and in Maine are known to have been stimulated from Montreal. Father Rasle, an astute and benevolent French Jesuit who had settled among the Indians at Norridgewock, became an agent of this hostile influence. In an English attack, August 12, 1724, Rasle's settlement was broken up and himself killed. The Indians next year made a treaty, and peace prevailed till King George's War.

This opened in 1744, England against France once more, and in 1745 came the capture of Louisburg, then the Gibraltar of America. This was brought about through the energy of Governor Shirley, of Massachusetts, the most efficient English commander this side the Atlantic. That commonwealth voted to send 3,250 men, Connecticut 500, New Hampshire and Rhode Island each 300. Sir William Pepperill, of Kittery, Me., commanded, Richard Gridley, of Bunker Hill fame, being his chief of artillery. The expedition consisted of thirteen armed vessels, commanded by Captain Edward Tyng, with over 200 guns, and about ninety transports. The Massachusetts troops sailed from Nantasket March 24th, and reached Canso April 4th. "Rhode Island," says Hutchinson, "waited until a better judgment could be made of the event, their three hundred not arriving until after the

place had surrendered." The expedition was very costly to the colonies participating, and four years later England reimbursed them in the sum of 200,000 pounds. Yet at the disgraceful peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, she surrendered Louisburg and all Cape Breton to France again.

In 1746 French and Indians from Crown Point destroyed the fort and twenty houses at Saratoga, killing thirty persons, and capturing sixty. Orders came this year from England to advance on Crown Point and Montreal, upon Shirley's plan, all the colonies as far south as Virginia being commanded to aid. Quite an army mustered at Albany. Sir William Johnson succeeded in rousing the Iroquois, whom the French had been courting with unprecedented assiduity. But D'Anville's fleet threatened. The colonies wanted their troops at home. Inactivity discouraged the soldiers, alienated the Indians. At last news came that the Canada project was abandoned, and in 1748 the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was declared.

This very year France began new efforts to fill the Ohio Valley with emigrants. Virginia did the same. To anticipate the English the French sent Bienville to bury engraved leaden plates at the mouths of streams. They also fortified the present sites of Ogdensburg and Toronto. Even now, therefore, France's power this side the Atlantic was not visibly shaken. The continental problem remained unsolved.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR

THE Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle had been made only because the contestants were tired of fighting. In America, at least, each at once began taking breath and preparing to renew the struggle. Not a year passed that did not witness border quarrels more or less bloody. The French authorities filled the Ohio and Mississippi valleys with military posts; English settlers pressed persistently into the same to find homes. In this movement Virginia led, having in 1748 formed, especially to aid western settlement, the Ohio Company, which received from the king a grant of five hundred thousand acres beyond the Alleghanies. A road was laid out between the upper Potomac and the present Pittsburgh, settlements were begun along it, and efforts made to conciliate the savages.

One of the frontier villages was at what is now Franklin, Peun., and the location involved Virginia with the colony of Pennsylvania. As commissioner to settle the dispute George Washington was sent out.

The future Father of his Country was of humble origin. Born in Westmoreland County, Va., "about ten in ye morning of ye 11th day of Feb-

ruary, 1731-32," as recorded in his mother's Bible, he had been an orphan from his earliest youth. His education was of the slenderest. At sixteen he became a land surveyor, leading a life of the roughest sort, beasts, savages, and hardy frontiersmen his constant companions, sleeping under the sky and cooking his own coarse food. No better man could have been chosen to thread now the Alleghany trail.

Washington reported the French strongly posted in western Pennsylvania on lands claimed by the Ohio Company. Virginia fitted out an expedition to dislodge them. Of this Washington commanded the advance. Meeting at Great Meadows the French under Contrecoeur, commander of Fort Du Quesne (Pittsburgh), he was at first victorious, but the French were re-enforced before he was, and Washington, after a gallant struggle, had to capitulate. This was on July 3, 1754. The French and Indian War had begun.

The English Government bade the colonies defend their frontier, and in this interest twenty-five delegates from the seven northern colonies met at Albany on June 19, 1754. Benjamin Franklin represented Pennsylvania, and it was at this conference that he presented his well-considered plan, to be described in our chapter on Independence, for a general government over English America. The Albany Convention amounted to little, but did somewhat to renew alliance with the Six Nations.\*

In this decisive war England had in view four great objects of conquest in America: 1. Fort

\* Increased from five to six by the accession of the Tuscaroras.

Du Quesne ; 2. The Ontario basin with Oswego and Fort Niagara ; 3. The Champlain Valley ; 4. Louisburg. The British ministry seemed in earnest. It sent Sir Edward Braddock to this side with six thousand splendidly equipped veterans, and offered large sums for fitting out regiments of provincials. Braddock arrived in February, 1755, but moved very languidly. This was not altogether his fault, for he had difficulties with the governors and they with their legislatures.

At last off for Fort Du Quesne, he took a needlessly long route, through Virginia instead of Pennsylvania. He scorned advice, marching and fighting stiffly according to the rules of the Old World military art, heeding none of Franklin's and Washington's sage hints touching savage modes of warfare. The consequence was this brave Briton's defeat and death. As he drew near to Fort Du Quesne, he fell into a carefully prepared ambuscade. Four horses were shot under him. Mounting a fifth he spurred to the front to inspire his men, forbidding them seek the slightest cover, as Washington urged and as the provincials successfully did. The regulars, obeying, were half of them killed in their tracks, the remainder retreating, in panic at first, to Philadelphia. Braddock died, and was buried at Great Meadows, where his grave is still to be seen.

Washington was the only mounted officer in this action who was not killed or fatally wounded, a fact at the time regarded specially providential. On his return, aged twenty-three, the Rev. Samuel Davies, afterward President of the College of New

Jersey, referred to him in a sermon as "that heroic youth, Colonel Washington, whom I cannot but hope Providence has preserved in so signal a manner for some important service to his country."

The early part of this war witnessed the tragic occurrence immortalized by Longfellow's "Evangeline," the expulsion of the French from Acadia. The poem is too favorable to these people. They had never become reconciled to English rule, and were believed on strong evidence to be active in promoting French schemes against the English. It was resolved to scatter them among the Atlantic settlements. The act was savage, and became doubly so through the unmeant cruelties attending its execution. The poor wretches were huddled on the shore weeks too soon for their transports. Families were broken up, children forcibly separated from parents. The largest company was carried to Massachusetts, many to Pennsylvania, some to the extreme South. Not a few, crushed in spirit, became paupers. A number found their way to France, a number to Louisiana, a handful back to Nova Scotia.

Braddock was succeeded by the fussy and incompetent Earl of Loudon, 1756-57, whom Franklin likened to Saint George on the sign-posts, "always galloping but never advancing." He gathered twelve thousand men for the recapture of Louisburg, but exaggerated reports of the French strength frightened him from the attempt. Similar inaction lost him Fort William Henry on Lake George. The end of the year 1757 saw the English cause on this side at low ebb, Montcalm, the

tried and brilliant French commander, having outwitted or frightened the English officers at every point.

From this moment all changes. William Pitt subsequently Lord Chatham, now became the soul of the British ministry. George III. had dismissed him therefrom in 1757, but Newcastle found it impossible to get on without him. The great commoner had to be recalled, this time to take entire direction of the war.

Pitt had set his mind on the conquest of Canada. He superseded Loudon early in 1758 by General Amherst, who was seconded by Wolfe and by Admiral Boscawen, both with large re-enforcements. They were to reduce Louisburg. It was an innovation to assign important commands like these to men with so little fame and influence, but Pitt did not care. He believed his appointees to be brave, energetic, skilful, and the event proved his wisdom. Louisburg fell, and with it the whole of Cape Breton Island and also Prince Edward.

Unfortunately General Abercrombie had not been recalled with Loudon. The same year, 1758, he signally failed to capture Ticonderoga, leaving the way to Montreal worse blocked than before. Fort Du Quesne, however, General Forbes took this year at little cost, rechristening it Pittsburgh in honor of the heroic minister who had ordered the enterprise.

In the year 1759 occurred a grand triple movement upon Canada. Amherst, now general-in-chief, was to clear the Champlain Valley, and Prideaux with large colonial forces to reduce Fort



Niagara. Both had orders, being successful in these initial attacks, to move down the St. Lawrence and unite with Wolfe, who was to sail up that river and beset Quebec. Prideaux was splendidly successful, as indeed was Amherst in time, though longer than he anticipated in securing Ticonderoga and Crown Point.

Meantime Wolfe at Quebec was trying in all ways to manoeuvre the crafty Montcalm out of his impregnable works. Failing, he in his eagerness suffered himself to attempt an assault upon the city, which proved not only vain but terribly costly. A weaker commander would now have given up, but Wolfe had red hair, and the grit usually accompanying. Undaunted, he planned the hazardous enterprise of rowing up the St. Lawrence by night, landing with five thousand picked men at the foot of the precipitous ascent to the Plains of Abraham, and scaling those heights to face Montcalm from the west. The Frenchman, stunned at the sight which day brought him, lost no time in attacking. In the hot battle which ensued, September 13, 1759, both commanders fell, Wolfe cheering his heroes to sure victory, Montcalm urging on his forlorn hope in vain. The English remained masters of the field and in five days Quebec capitulated.

Vaudreuil, the French commander at Montreal, sought to dislodge the English ere the ice left the river in the spring of 1760, and succeeded in driving them within their works. Each side then waited and hoped for help from beyond sea so soon as navigation opened. It came the earlier to the

English, who were gladdened on May 11th by the approach of a British frigate, the forerunner of a fleet. They now chased Vaudreuil back into Montreal, where they were met by Haviland from Crown Point and by Amherst from Oswego. France's days of power in America were ended. Her fleet of twenty-two sail intended for succor met total destruction in the Bay des Chaleurs, and by the Peace of Paris, 1763, she surrendered to her victorious antagonist every foot of her American territory east of the Mississippi, save the city of New Orleans.

The Indians were thus left to finish this war alone. Pontiac, the brave and cunning Chief of the Ottawas, aghast at the rising might of the English, and the certain fate of his race without the French for helpers, organized a conspiracy including nearly every tribe this side the Mississippi except the Six Nations, to put to the sword all the English garrisons in the West. Fatal success waited upon the plan. It was in 1763. Forts Sandusky, St. Joseph (southeast of Lake Michigan), Miami (Fort Wayne), Presque Isle (Erie, Pa.), Le Bœuf, Venango, and Pittsburgh were attacked and all but the last destroyed, soldiers and settlers murdered with indescribable barbarities. Pittsburgh held out till re-enforced, at dreadful cost in blood, by Colonel Bouquet and his Highlanders, who marched from Philadelphia.

The hottest and longest conflict was at Detroit, Major Gladwyn commanding, where Pontiac himself led the onset, heading perhaps a thousand men. The siege was maintained with fearful venom from

May 11th till into October. The English tried a number of sallies, brave, fatal, vain, and were so hard pressed by their blood-thirsty foe that only timely and repeated re-enforcements saved them. At last the savages, becoming, as always, disunited and straitened for supplies, sullenly made peace; and at the call of the rich and now free Northwest, caravans of English immigrants thronged thither to lay under happiest auspices the foundations of new States.

## PERIOD III.

### *REVOLUTION AND THE OLD CONFEDERATION*

1763-1789

#### CHAPTER I.

##### RESULTS OF THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR

THE results of the French and Indian War were out of all proportion to the scale of its military operations. Contrasted with the campaigns which were then shaking all Europe, it sank into insignificance; and the world, its eyes strained to see the magnitude and the issue of those European wars, little surmised that they would dictate the course of history far less than yonder desultory campaigning in America. Yet here and there a political prophet foresaw some of these momentous indirect consequences of the war. "England will ere long repent," said Vergennes, then the French ambassador at Constantinople, "of having removed the only check that could keep her colonies in awe. They no longer stand in need of her protection. She will call on them to contribute toward supporting the burdens they have helped to bring upon her, and they will answer by

striking off all dependence." This is, in outline, the history of the next twenty years.

The war in Europe and America had been a heavy drain upon the treasury of England. Her national debt had doubled, amounting at the conclusion of peace to £140,000,000 sterling. The Government naturally desired to lay upon its American subjects a portion of this burden, which had been incurred partly on their behalf. The result was that new system of taxation which the king and his ministers sought to impose upon the colonies, and which was the immediate cause of the Revolution. The hated taxes cannot, of course, be traced to the French and Indian War alone as their source. England had for years shown a growing purpose to get revenue out of her American dependencies; but the debt incurred by the war gave an animus and a momentum to this policy which carried it forward in the face of opposition that might otherwise have warned even George II. to pause ere it was too late.

While the war thus indirectly led England to encroach upon the rights of the colonies, it also did much to prepare the latter to resist such encroachment. It had this effect mainly in two ways: by promoting union among the colonies, and by giving to many of their citizens a good training in the duties of camp, march, and battle-field.

The value to the colonists of their military experience in this war can hardly be over-estimated. If the outbreak of the Revolution had found the Americans a generation of civilians, if the colonial

cause had lacked the privates who had seen hard service at Lake George and Louisburg, or the officers, such as Washington, Gates, Montgomery, Stark, and Putnam, who had learned to fight successfully against British regulars by fighting with them, it is a question whether the uprising would not have been stamped out, for a time at least, almost at its inception. Especially at the beginning of such a war, when the first necessity is to get a peaceful nation under arms as quickly as possible, a few soldier-citizens are invaluable. They form the nucleus of the rising army, and set the standard for military organization and discipline. In fact, the French and Indian War would have repaid the colonies all it cost even if its only result had been to give the youthful Washington that schooling in arms which helped fit him to command the Continental armies. Without the Washington of Fort Necessity and of Braddock's defeat, we could in all likelihood never have had the Washington of Trenton and Yorktown. Besides Washington, to say nothing of Gates, Gage, and Mercer, also there, Dan Morgan, of Virginia, began to learn war in the Braddock campaign.

Again, the war prepared the colonists for the Revolution by revealing to them their own rare fighting quality, and by showing that the dreaded British regulars were not invincible. No foe would, at Saratoga or Monmouth, see the backs of the men who had covered the redcoats' retreat from the field of Braddock's death, scaled the abatis of Louisburg, or brained Dieskau's regulars on the parapet of Fort William Henry.

But there was one thing even more necessary to the Revolutionists than skill at arms, and that was union. Their only hope of successful resistance against the might of England lay in concerted action, and perhaps the most important result of the long war through which they had been passing was the sense of union and of a common cause with which it had inspired the thirteen colonies. This feeling was of course still none too intense. But during the long war the colonies had drawn nearer to one another than ever before. Soldiers from New Hampshire and North Carolina, from Virginia and Massachusetts, bivouacked together, and fought shoulder to shoulder. Colonial officers forgot local jealousies in a common resentment of the contempt and neglect shown them all alike by the haughty subalterns of the king. Mutual good-will was fostered by the money and troops which the southern and less exposed colonies sent to their sister commonwealths on the frontier. In these and numberless minor ways a community of sentiment was engendered which, imperfect as it was, yet prepared the way for that hearty co-operation which was to carry the infant States through the fiery trial just before them.

It is important to remember, as well, not only that the war built up this conviction of a common interest, but that nothing except the war could have done it. The great forces of nineteenth-century civilization — the locomotive, the telegraph, the modern daily newspaper — which now bind sixty millions of people, spread over half a continent, into one nation, were then unknown. The

means of communication and transportation between the colonies were very primitive. Roads were rough, full of steeps and cuts, and in many places, especially near cities, almost impassable with mire. It took seven days to go by stage from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, four days from Boston to New York. The mail service was correspondingly inadequate and slow. At times in winter a letter would be five weeks in going from Philadelphia to Virginia. The newspapers were few, contained little news, and the circulation of each was necessarily confined to a very limited area. It has been estimated that the reading-matter in all the forty-three papers which existed at the close of the Revolution would not fill ten pages of the New York *Herald* now. In connection with this state of things consider the fact that the idea of colonial solidarity had not then, as now, merely to be sustained. It had to be created outright. Local pride and jealousy were still strong. Each colony had thought of itself as a complete and isolated political body, in a way which it is difficult for us, after a hundred years of national unity, to conceive. Plainly a lifetime of peace would not have begotten the same degree of consolidation among the colonies which the war, with its common danger and common purpose, called into being in a half-dozen years.

The war did yet another important service by removing a dangerous neighbor of the colonies. So long as France, ambitious and warlike, kept foot-hold in the New World, the colonies had to look to the mother-country for protection. But



this danger gone, England ceased to be necessary to the safety of the embryo political communities, and her sovereignty was therefore the more readily renounced. English statesmen foresaw this danger before the Peace of Paris, and but for the magnanimity of Pitt our western territory might after all have been left in the hands of France.

And the cession of Canada, besides removing an enemy, helped to transform that enemy into an active friend. Had France retained her possessions in America, she would still have had an interest in maintaining the colonial system, and it is doubtful if even her hatred of England would have induced her to aid the rebellious colonies. But, her dream of a great Western empire forever dispelled, she had much to gain and nothing to lose by drawing sword for the American cause. The British defeated the French at Quebec only to meet them again at Yorktown.

One more result remains to be noted, without which what has preceded would lose half its significance. By the Peace of Paris England succeeded to all of France's possessions in America east of the Mississippi; but the most valuable part of this great territory she won only to hold in trust a few years for her colonial children. The redcoats under Amherst and Wolfe, who thought they were fighting for King George, were in reality winning an empire for the Young Republic. It is not easy to feel the full significance of this. The colonies might, indeed, have won independence even if France had retained her grasp on the valley of the Mississippi; but so long as the new-

born nation was shut up to a narrow strip along the Atlantic coast, it would have been a lion caged. The "conquest of Canada," says Green, "by . . . flinging open to their energies in the days to come the boundless plains of the West, laid the foundation of the United States."

## CHAPTER II.

### GEORGE III. AND HIS AMERICAN COLONIES

THE year after the capture of Quebec a young king ascended the throne of England, whose action was to affect profoundly the fortunes of the American colonies. Of narrow mental range and plebeian tastes, but moral, sincere, and stout-hearted, George III. assumed the crown with one dominant purpose—to *rule* personally; and the first decade of his reign was a constant struggle to free himself from the dictation of cabinet ministers. In 1770, during the premiership of North, who was little more than his page, the king gained the day; and for the next dozen years he had his own way perfectly. All points of policy, foreign and domestic, even the management of debates in Parliament, he was crafty enough to get into his hands. To this meddling of his with state affairs, his impracticable and fickle plans, and the stupidity of the admirers whom his policy forced upon him, may be traced in very large measure the breach between England and the colonies.

The Revolution, however, cannot be wholly accounted for by any series of events which can be set down and labelled. The ultimate causes lie deeper. Three thousand miles of ocean rolled be-

tween England and the colonies. A considerable measure of colonial self-government was inevitable from the first, and this, by fostering the spirit of independence, created a demand for more and more freedom. The social ties which had bound the early Pilgrims to their native land grew steadily weaker with each new generation of people who knew no home but America. The colonists had begun to feel the stirrings of an independent national life. The boundless possibilities of the future on this new continent, with its immense territory and untold natural wealth, were beginning to dawn upon them. Their infancy was over. The leading-strings which bound them to the mother-country must be either lengthened or cast off altogether.

But England did not see this. Most Englishmen at the beginning of George III.'s reign regarded the colonies as trading-corporations rather than as political bodies. It was taken for granted that a colony was inferior to the mother-country, and was to be managed in the interests of the commercial classes at home. Conflict was therefore inevitable sooner or later. We have to trace briefly the chief events by which it was precipitated.

In 1760-61 England tried to enforce the navigation laws more strictly. Writs of assistance issued, empowering officers to enter any house at any time, to search for smuggled goods. This measure aroused a storm of indignation. The popular feeling was voiced, and at the same time intensified, by the action of James Otis, Jr., a young

Boston lawyer, who threw up his position as advocate-general rather than defend the hated writs, which he denounced as "instruments of slavery." "Then and there," said John Adams, "the trumpet of the Revolution was sounded."

In May, 1764, a report reached Boston that a stamp act for the colonies had been proposed in Parliament, to raise revenue by forcing the use in America of stamped forms for all sorts of public papers, such as deeds, warrants, and the like. A feeling of mingled rage and alarm seized the colonists. It seemed that a deliberate blow was about to be struck at their liberties. From the day of their founding the colonies had never been taxed directly except by their own legislatures. Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Virginia at once sent humble but earnest protests to Parliament against the proposed innovation.

The act was nevertheless passed in March of the next year, with almost no opposition. By its provisions, business documents were illegal and void unless written on the stamped paper. The cheapest stamp cost a shilling, the price ranging upward from that according to the importance of the document. The prepared paper had to be paid for in specie, a hardship indeed in a community where lawsuits were very common, and whose entire solid coin would not have sufficed to pay the revenue for a single year. Even bitterest Tories declared this requirement indefensible. Another flagrant feature of the act was the provision that violators of it should be tried without a jury, before a judge

whose only pay came from his own condemnations.

The effect upon the colonies was like that of a bomb in a powder-magazine. The people rose up *en masse*. In every province the stamp-distributor was compelled to resign. In Portsmouth, N. H., the newspaper came out in mourning, and an effigy of the Goddess of Liberty was carried to the grave. The Connecticut legislature ordered a day of fasting and prayer kept, and an inventory of powder and ball taken. In New York a bonfire was made of the stamps in the public square. The bells in Charleston, S. C., were tolled, and the flags on the ships in the harbor hung at half-mast. The colonists entered into agreements to buy no goods from England until the act was repealed. Even mourning clothes, since they must be imported, were not to be worn, and lamb's flesh was abjured that more wool might be raised for home manufacture. England's colonial trade fell off so alarmingly in consequence that Manchester manufacturers petitioned Parliament to repeal the act, asserting that nine-tenths of their workmen were idle. Besides these popular demonstrations, delegates from nine colonies met in New York, in October, 1765, often called the Stamp Act Congress, and adopted a declaration of rights, asserting that England had no right to tax them without their consent. During the days of the Stamp Act excitement, the term "colonist" gave way to "American" and "English" to "British," a term of the deeper opprobrium because Bute, the king's chief adviser, was a Briton.

Startled by this unexpected resistance, Parlia-

ment, in January of the next year, began to debate repeal. We must in fairness to England look at both sides of the problem of colonial taxation. As general administrator of colonial affairs, the English Government naturally desired a fixed and certain revenue in America, both for frontier defence against Indians and French and for the payment of colonial governors. While each stood ready to defend its own territory, the colonies were no doubt meanly slow about contributing to any common fund. They were frequently at loggerheads, too, with their governors over the question of salaries. On the other hand, the colonists made the strong plea that self-taxation was their only safeguard against tyranny of king, Parliament, or governor.

In the great debate which now ensued in Parliament over England's right to tax America, Mansfield, the greatest constitutional lawyer of his day, maintained—*first*, that America was represented in Parliament as much as Manchester and several other large cities in England which elected no members to the House of Commons, and yet were taxed; and *second*, that an internal tax, such as that on stamps, was identical in principle with customs duties, which the colonies had never resisted. In reply, Pitt, the great champion of the colonies, asserted—*first*, that the case of the colonies was not at all like that of Manchester; the latter happened not to be represented at that time because the election laws needed reforming, while the colonies, being three thousand miles away, could in the nature of the case never be adequately

represented in an English Parliament ; and, *second*, that as a matter of fact a sharp distinction had always, since the Great Charter, been made between internal taxation and customs duties.

Had the colonies rested their case upon constitutional argument alone it would have been relatively weak. While it was then a question, and will be forever, whether the American settlements were king's colonies, Parliament's colonies, or neither, but peculiar communities which had resulted from growth, the English lawyers had a good deal of logic on their side. Unconstitutional measures had indeed been resorted to—the writs of assistance, taking Americans beyond sea for trial, internal taxation ; yet the real grievance lay far less in these things than in the fact that the English constitution itself was working in a manner contrary to colonial interests. Social considerations, too, accounted for more bitterness than has usually been thought. Our fathers hated the presence here of a privileged class.

George III.'s policy was therefore wiser legally than politically. This was, in fact, his ministry's capital mistake—like Lord Salisbury's in respect to Ireland in 1888—that it had too great regard for the mere legal aspect of the question, ignoring the practical. The colonists were too numerous, powerful, and far away longer to be governed from home, at least by the old plan. To attempt perpetuation of the old *régime* might be lawful, but was certainly impracticable and stupid. Hence Americans like Jefferson showed themselves consummate politicians in going beyond Pitt's con-



tention from the constitution and from precedent, and appealing to the "natural rights" of the colonists. "Our rights," said Otis, in substance, "do not rest on a charter, but are inherent in us as men." "The people," said John Adams in 1765, "have rights antecedent to all earthly government."

The Stamp Act was repealed in February. Its principle, however, was immediately re-asserted by the "Declaratory Act," in which Parliament claimed power over the colonies "in all cases whatsoever." The repeal caused great rejoicing in America; but neither king nor Parliament had changed policy respecting colonial affairs. There soon followed, in rapid succession, that series of blundering acts of oppression which completed the work begun by the Stamp Act, and drove the colonists into rebellion.

In 1767 duties were laid upon glass, paper, painters' colors, and tea. Massachusetts, again taking the lead, sent a circular-letter to all the colonies, proposing a united supplication to the throne. For refusal to rescind this letter the Massachusetts assembly was dissolved at the command of the angry king. This refusal was the first denial of the king's prerogative; only the authority of Parliament had been resisted before. The soul of the colonial cause in Massachusetts at this time was Samuel Adams, of Boston, "the last of the Puritans," a man of powerful and logical mind, intrepid heart, and incorruptible patriotism. America's debt to him for his work in these early years cannot be estimated. At this juncture he

organized committees of safety and correspondence throughout Massachusetts, which led to the formation of such committees in the other colonies. They did an invaluable work in binding the scattered sections together, and providing for emergencies.

The Billeting Act, which required the colonists to lodge and feed the British troops quartered among them, added fuel to the flames. In 1768 the New York legislature refused to comply, and Parliament suspended its legislative functions.

In the fall of the same year, seizing as a pretext two ship-riots which had occurred in the summer, the king stationed four regiments in Boston. Public sentiment was shocked and indignant at this establishment of a military guard over a peaceable community. The presence of the soldiers was a constant source of irritation. Frequent altercations occurred between the soldiers and the lower class of citizens. The trouble culminated in the Boston Massacre of March 5, 1770. A squad of soldiers, set upon by a mob of men and boys, fired into the crowd, killing three persons and wounding eight others. That the soldiers had considerable justification is proved by the fact that a jury acquitted all but two, who were convicted of manslaughter, and branded. But exaggerated reports of the occurrence spread like wildfire throughout the colonies, and wrought powerfully for hatred against England.

During the next two or three years there was comparative quiet. Massachusetts, it is true, under the tutelage of Samuel Adams, grew more

radical in its demands. In 1772 the committee of Boston issued a statement of grievances, adding, as new complaints, the sending of persons to England for trial, restraints upon colonial manufacturers, and a rumored plan to establish bishops over America. This statement was approved by all the colonies, and was sent to Franklin in London. The country as a whole, however, was weary of the strife, and would gladly have returned to the old cordial relations with the mother-land.

But George III. could not rest without asserting his supremacy over America. He made an arrangement with the East India Company by which tea could be bought in America, spite of the hated tax, cheaper than in England. Then, at the king's instigation, large shipments of tea were made to America. The colonists saw through the cunning attempt, and the tide of resistance rose higher than ever. At New York and Philadelphia the tea-ships were forced to put to sea again without unloading. At Charleston the tea was stored in damp cellars and soon spoiled. At Boston there was a deadlock; the people would not let the tea be landed. The governor would not let the ships sail without unloading. On the evening of December 16, 1773, the tax falling due on the next day, a party of fifty citizens, disguised as Indians, boarded the ships, and threw three hundred and forty-two chests of tea into the harbor.

The Boston tea-party aroused all the blind obstinacy of George III. "Blows must decide," he exclaimed; "the guilty rebels are to be forced to submission." The king's anger led to the Boston

Port Bill, which was passed the next year, and closed Boston harbor to all commerce. Changes were also made in the government of Massachusetts, rendering it almost entirely independent of the people. Town meetings were forbidden except for elections. Poor Massachusetts, her liberties curtailed, her commerce ruined, appealed to her sister colonies for support, and they responded right heartily. In three weeks from the news of the Port Bill all the colonies had made the cause of Massachusetts their own. Expressions of sympathy and liberal gifts of money and provisions poured into Boston from all over the country. The first Continental Congress assembled at Philadelphia in September. All the colonies but Georgia were represented. An earnest statement of grievances was drawn up, with a prayer to the king for redress. The action of Massachusetts was approved, and an agreement entered into to suspend all commerce with England.

Things now hastened rapidly toward open war. British troops were stationed in Boston, and began fortification. Military preparations were making everywhere among the colonists. The train was laid. Only a spark was needed to bring the dreaded explosion.

## CHAPTER III.

### INDEPENDENCE AND THE NEW STATES

THE thought of independence in the minds of the colonists was of surprisingly slow growth. The feeling of dependence on the mother-country and of loyalty to the king were deep-rooted and died hard. Even union, which was a pre-requisite to a successful struggle for independence, came slowly. The old New England Confederation, in 1643-84, between Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven, for defence against Indians, Dutch, and French, ended without ever having manifested the slightest vigor. In the latter half of the seventeenth century Virginia had alliances with some sister colonies for protection against Indians; but there was no call for a general congress until the French and Indian attack on Schenectady, in 1690, during King William's War. Representatives from New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Plymouth met that year at New York; letters came from Virginia, Maryland, and Rhode Island. But no permanent union was proposed here, nor at any of the similar meetings, seven at least, which occurred between 1690 and 1750.

The Albany Convention, which met in 1754 to

prepare for the French and Indian War, adopted a plan for union presented by Franklin, providing for a president-general appointed and supported by the crown, and for a grand council of delegates elected triennially by the colonies according to population, and empowered, within limits, to lay taxes and make laws for the common interest of English America. Franklin believed that the adoption of this scheme would have postponed the Revolution a century. But, as it gave so much power to the king, it was rejected by the people in every colony.

Even after English oppression and the diligent agency of committees of correspondence had brought union, and delegates from the colonies had met again and again in Congress, the thought of breaking away from the mother-land was strange to the minds of nearly all. The instructions to the delegates to the first Congress, in September, 1774, gave no suggestion of independence. On the contrary, colony after colony urged its representatives to seek the restoration of "harmony and union" with England. This Congress branded as "calumny" the charge that it wished "independency." Washington wrote, from the Congress, that independence was then not "desired by any thinking man in America."

The feeling was much the same in 1775. Pennsylvania "strictly" commanded her representatives to dissent from any "proposition that may lead to separation." Maryland gave similar instructions in January, 1776. Independence was neither the avowed nor the conscious object in defending

Bunker Hill, June 17, 1775. Washington's commission as commander-in-chief, two days later, gave no hint of it. And the New Hampshire legislature so late as December 25, 1775, in the very act of framing a new state government, "totally disavowed" all such aim. In the fall of 1775 Congress declared that it had "not raised armies with the ambitious design of separation from Great Britain."

The swift change which, a little more than six months later, made the Declaration of Independence possible and even popular, has never yet been fully explained. In May, 1775, John Adams had been cautioned by the Philadelphia Sons of Liberty not to utter the word independence. "It is as unpopular," they said, in "Pennsylvania and all the Middle and Southern States as the Stamp Act itself." Early in 1776 this same great man wrote that there was hardly a newspaper in America but openly advocated independence. In the spring of 1776 the conservative Washington declared, "Reconciliation is impracticable. Nothing but independence will save us." Statesmen began to see that longer delay was dangerous, that permanent union turned upon independence, and that, without a government of their own, people would by and by demand back their old constitution, as the English did after Cromwell's death. "The country is not only ripe for independence," said Wither-  
spoon, of New Jersey, debating in Congress, "but is in danger of becoming rotten for lack of it."

Colony after colony now came rapidly into line. Massachusetts gave instructions to her delegates

in Congress, virtually favoring independence, in January, 1776. Georgia did the same in February, South Carolina in March. Express authority to "concur in independency" came first from North Carolina, April 12th, and the following May 31st Mecklenburg County in that State explicitly declared its independence of England. On May 1st Massachusetts began to disuse the king's name in public instruments. May 4th, Rhode Island renounced allegiance almost in terms. On May 15th brave old Virginia ordered her delegates in Congress to bite right into the sour apple and propose independence. Connecticut, New Hampshire, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania took action in the same direction during the following month.

The king's brutal attitude had much to do with this sudden change. The colonists had nursed the belief that the king was misled by his ministers. A last petition, couched in respectful terms, was drawn up by Congress in the summer of 1775, and sent to England. Out of respect to the feelings of good John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, who still clung to England, this address was tempered with a submissiveness which offended many members. On its being read, Dickinson remarked that but one word in it displeased him, the word "Congress;" to which Colonel Ben Harrison, of Virginia, retorted that but one word in it pleased him, and that "Congress" was precisely the word.

The appeal was idle. The king's only answer was a violent proclamation denouncing the Americans as rebels. It was learned at the same time that he was preparing to place Indians, negroes,



and German mercenaries in arms against them. The truth was forced upon the most reluctant that the root of England's obduracy was in the king personally, and that further supplications were useless. The surprising success of the colonial arms, the shedding of blood at Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill—all which, remember, antedated the Declaration—the increase and the ravages of the royal army and navy in America, were all efficient in urging the colonists to break utterly and forever from the mother-country.

The behavior of the Gaspé officers in Narragansett Bay, their illegal seizures, plundering expeditions on shore, and wanton manners in stopping and searching boats, illustrate the spirit of the king's hirelings in America at this time. At last the Rhode Islanders could endure it no longer. Early on the morning of June 9, 1772, Captain Abraham Whipple, with a few boat-loads of trusty aides, dropped down the river from Providence to what is now called Gaspé Point, six or seven miles below the city, where the offending craft had run aground the previous evening in giving chase to the Newport-Providence packet-boat, and after a spirited fight mastered the Gaspé's company, put them on shore, and burned the ship. There would be much propriety in dating the Revolution from this daring act.

Nor was this the only case of Rhode Island's forwardness in the struggle. December 5, 1774, her General Assembly ordered Colonel Nightingale to remove to Providence all the cannon and ammunition of Fort George, except three guns,

and this was done before the end of the next day. More than forty cannon, with much powder and shot, were thus husbanded for service to come. News of this was carried to New Hampshire, and resulted in the capture of Fort William and Mary at New Castle, December 14, 1774, which some have referred to as the opening act of the Revolution. This deed was accomplished by fourteen men from Durham, who entered the fort at night when the officers were at a ball in Portsmouth. The powder which they captured is said to have done duty at Bunker Hill.

Most potent of all as a cause of the resolution to separate was Thomas Paine's pamphlet, "Common Sense," published in January, 1776, and circulated widely throughout the colonies. Its lucid style, its homely way of putting things, and its appeals to Scripture must have given it at any rate a strong hold upon the masses of the people. It was doubly and trebly triumphant from the fact that it voiced, in clear, bold terms, a long-growing, popular conviction of the propriety of independence, stronger than men had dared to admit even to themselves.

On June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, rose in Congress, and, in obedience to the command of his State, moved a resolution "that the united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." John Adams seconded the motion. It led to great debate, which evinced that New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and South Carolina were not yet quite ready for so radical a step. Postponement was

therefore had till July 1st, a committee meantime being appointed to draft a declaration.

On July 2d, after further long debate, participated in by John Adams, Dickinson, Wilson, and many other of the ablest men in Congress, not all, even now, favorable to the measure, the famous Declaration of Independence was adopted by vote of all the colonies but New York, whose representatives abstained from voting for lack of sufficiently definite instructions. We celebrate July 4th because on that day the document was authenticated by the signatures of the President and Secretary of Congress, and published. Not until August 2d had all the representatives affixed their names. Ellery stood at the secretary's side as the various delegates signed, and declares that he saw only dauntless resolution in every eye. "Now we must hang together," said Franklin, "or we shall hang separately."

The honor of writing the Declaration belongs to Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, who was to play so prominent a part in the early political history of the United States. At this time he was thirty-three years old. He was by profession a lawyer, of elegant tastes, well read in literature, deeply versed in political history and philosophy. He was chosen to draft the instrument chiefly because of the great ability of other state papers from his pen. It is said that he consulted no books during the composition, but wrote from the overflowing fulness of his mind.

It is an interesting inquiry how far the language of the document was determined by utterances of

a like kind already put forth by towns and counties. There had been many of these, and much discussion has occurred upon the question which of them was first. Perhaps the honor belongs to the town of Sheffield, Mass., which so early as January 12, 1773, proclaimed the grievances and the rights of the colonies, among these the right of self-government. Mendon, in the same State, in the same year passed resolutions containing three fundamental propositions of the great Declaration itself: that all men have an equal right to life and liberty, that this right is inalienable, and that government must originate in the free consent of the people. It is worthy of note that the only important change made by Congress in what Jefferson had prepared was the striking out, in deference to South Carolina and Georgia, of a clause reflecting on slavery.

Copies of the immortal paper were carried post-haste up and down the land, and Congress's bold deed was everywhere hailed with enthusiastic demonstrations of joy. The stand for independence wrought powerfully for good, both at home and abroad. At home it assisted vacillating minds to a decision, as well as bound all the colonies more firmly together by committing them irreconcilably to an aggressive policy. Abroad it tended to lift the colonies out of the position of rebels and to gain them recognition among the nations of the earth.

Let us now inquire into the political character of these bodies of people which this Declaration by their delegates had erected into "free and independant States."

Five colonies had adopted constitutions, revolutionary of course, before the decisive manifesto. There was urgent need for such action. The few remaining fragments of royal governments were powerless and decadent. Anarchy was threatening everywhere. Some of the royal governors had fled. In South Carolina the judges refused to act. In other places, as western Massachusetts, they had been forcibly prevented from acting. In most of the colonies only small parts of the old assemblies could be gotten together.

New Hampshire led off with a new constitution in January, 1776. South Carolina followed in March. By the close of the year nearly all the colonies had established governments of their own. New York and Georgia did not formally adopt new constitutions until the next year. In Massachusetts a popular assembly assumed legislative and executive powers from July, 1775, till 1780, when a new constitution went into force. Connecticut and Rhode Island, as we have seen already, continued to use their royal charters—the former till 1818, the latter till 1842.

Nowhere was the general framework of government greatly changed by independence. The governors were of course now elected by the people, and they suffered some diminution of power. Legislatures were composed of two houses, both elective, no hereditary legislators being recognized. All the States still had Sunday laws; most of them had religious tests. In South Carolina only members of a church could vote. In New Jersey an office-holder must profess belief in the faith of

some Protestant sect. Pennsylvania required members of the legislature to avow faith in God, a future state, and the inspiration of the Scriptures. The new Massachusetts constitution provided that laws against plays, extravagance in dress, diet, etc., should be passed. Property qualifications continued to limit suffrage. Virginia and Georgia changed their land laws, abolishing entails and primogeniture.

The sole momentous novelty was that every one of the new constitutions proceeded upon the theory of popular sovereignty. The new governments derived their authority solely and directly from the people. And this authority, too, was not surrendered to the government, but simply—and this only in part—intrusted to it as the temporary agent of the sovereign people, who remained throughout the exclusive source of political power.

The new instruments of government were necessarily faulty and imperfect. All have since been amended, and several entirely remodelled. But they rescued the colonies from impending anarchy and carried them safely through the throes of the Revolution.





90 85 80 75 70

LAKE SUPERIOR  
LAKE MICHIGAN  
LAKE HURON  
LAKE ERIE  
L. ONTARIO  
F.N. Niagara

U. S. T. E. R. R. I. T. O. R. I. E. S.  
V. I. R. G. I. A.  
P. E. N. N. S. Y. L. V. A. N. I. A.  
N. E. W. Y. O. R. K.  
N. E. W. J. E. R. S. E. Y.

St. Louis  
Vincennes  
Ft. Wayne  
Pittsburgh  
Philadelphia  
New York  
Trenton  
Richmond  
Cape Henry  
Cape Charles  
Cape Hatteras


Memphis  
Nashville  
Raleigh  
Cape Fear  
C. Lookout

SOUTHWEST TERRITORY  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
N. C. until 1796  
S. C. until 1796

M. I. S. S. I. S. S. I. P. P. I.  
G. E. O. R. G. I. A.  
S. A. V. A. N. N. A. H.  
S. V. A. N. N. A. H.  
S. T. A. U. G. U. S. T. I. N. E.

GULF OF MEXICO  
ATLANTIC OCEAN  
B. A. H. A. M. A. I. S. L. A. N. D. S.

**THE UNITED COLONIES**  
AT THE  
BEGINNING OF THE REVOLUTION.



90 Longitude West 85 from Greenwich 80 75



## CHAPTER IV.

### OUTBREAK OF WAR: WASHINGTON'S MOVEMENTS

By the spring of 1775 Massachusetts was practically in rebellion. Every village green was a drill-ground, every church a town arsenal. General Gage occupied Boston with 3,000 British regulars. The flames were smouldering; at the slightest puff they would flash out into open war.

On the night of April 18th people along the road from Boston to Concord were roused from sleep by the cry of flying couriers—"To arms! The red-coats are coming!" When the British advance reached Lexington at early dawn, it found sixty or seventy minute-men drawn up on the green. "Disperse, ye rebels!" shouted the British officer. A volley was fired, and seven Americans fell dead. The king's troops, with a shout, pushed on to Concord. Most of the military stores, however, which they had come to destroy had been removed. A British detachment advanced to Concord Bridge, and in the skirmish here the Americans returned the British fire.

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,  
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,  
Here once the embattled farmers stood,  
And fired the shot heard round the world." \*

\* From R. W. Emerson's Concord Hymn, sung at the completion of the Battle Monument near Concord North Bridge, April 19, 1836.

The whole country was by this time swarming with minute-men. The crack of the rifle was heard from behind every wall and fence and tree along the line of march. The redcoats kept falling one by one at the hands of an invisible foe. The march became a retreat, the retreat almost a rout. At sunset the panting troops found shelter in Boston. Out of 1,800 nearly 300 were killed, wounded, or missing. The American loss was about ninety. The war of the rebellion had begun.

All that day and the next night the tramp of minute-men marching to Boston was heard throughout New England, and by April 20th Gage was cooped up in the city by an American army. May 25th, he received large re-enforcements from England.

On the night of June 16th a thousand men armed with pick and spade stole out of the American camp. At dawn the startled British found that a redoubt had sprung up in the night on Breed's Hill (henceforward Bunker Hill) in Charlestown. Boston was endangered, and the rebels must be dislodged. About half-past two 2,500 British regulars marched silently and in perfect order up the hill, expecting to drive out the "rustics" at the first charge. Colonel Prescott, the commanding American officer, waited till the regulars were within ten rods. "Fire!" A sheet of flame burst from the redoubt. The front ranks of the British melted away, and His Majesty's invincibles retreated in confusion to the foot of the hill. Again they advance. Again that terrible fire. Again they waver and fall back. Once more the plucky

fellows form for the charge, this time with bayonets alone. When they are within twenty yards, the muskets behind the earthworks send forth one deadly discharge, and then are silent. The ammunition is exhausted. The British swarm into the redoubt. The Continentals reluctantly retire, Prescott among the last, his coat rent by bayonets. Joseph Warren, of Boston, the idol of Massachusetts, was shot while leaving the redoubt. The British killed and wounded amounted to 1,054—157 of them being officers; the American loss was nearly 500. The battle put an end to further offensive movements by Gage. It was a virtual victory for the untrained farmer troops, and all America took courage.

Two days before, Congress had chosen George Washington commander-in-chief, and on July 2d he arrived at Cambridge. Washington was forty-three years old. Over six feet in height, and well-proportioned, he combined great dignity with ease. His early life as surveyor in a wild country had developed in him marvellous powers of endurance. His experience in the French and Indian War had given him considerable military knowledge. But his best title to the high honor now thrust upon him lay in his wonderful self-control, sound judgment, lofty patriotism, and sublime courage, which were to carry him, calm and unflinching, through perplexities and discouragements that would have overwhelmed a smaller or a meaner man.

Washington fought England with his hands tied. The Continental government was the worst possible for carrying on war. There was no executive. The

action of legislative committees was slow and vacillating, and at best Congress could not enforce obedience on the part of a colony. Congress, too, afraid of a standing army, would authorize only short enlistments, so that Washington had frequently to discharge one army and form another in the face of the enemy. His troops were ill-disciplined, and scantily supplied with clothing, tents, weapons, and ammunition. Skilled officers were few, and these rarely free from local and personal jealousies, impairing their efficiency.

Washington found that the army around Boston consisted of about 14,500 men fit for duty. He estimated the British forces at 11,000. All the fall and winter he was obliged to lie inactive for want of powder. Meantime he distressed the British as much as possible by a close siege. In the spring, having got more powder, he fortified Dorchester Heights. The city was now untenable, and on March 17, 1776, all the British troops, under command of Howe, who had succeeded Gage, sailed out of Boston harbor, never again to set foot on Massachusetts soil.

June 28th, a British fleet of ten vessels opened fire on Fort Moultrie, in Charleston harbor, S. C. The fort, commanded by Colonel Moultrie, returned the fire with remarkable accuracy, and after an engagement of twelve hours the fleet withdrew, badly crippled. This victory gave security to South Carolina and Georgia for three years.

The discomfited fleet sailed for New York, where the British forces were concentrating. The plan was to seize the Middle States, and thus keep North

and South from helping one another. August 1st, 2,500 English troops and 8,000 Hessians arrived. The effective British force was now about 25,000. Washington was holding New York City with about 10,000 men fit for duty.

Driven from Long Island by the battle of August 27th, and forced to abandon New York September 15th, Washington retreated up the Hudson, and took up a strong position at White Plains. Here the British, attacking, were defeated in a well-fought engagement; but as they were strongly re-enforced on October 30th, Washington fell back to Newcastle. Early in November, guessing that they intended to invade New Jersey and advance on Philadelphia, he threw his main force across the Hudson.

The fortunes of the American army were now at the lowest ebb, so that had Howe been an efficient general it must have been either captured or entirely destroyed. Through the treason of Adjutant Demont, who had deserted to Lord Percy with complete information of their weakness, Forts Washington and Mifflin were captured, November 16th and 20th, with the loss of 150 killed and wounded, and 2,634 prisoners, besides valuable stores, small arms, and forty-three pieces of artillery. Manhattan Island was lost. General Charles Lee, with a considerable portion of the army, persistently refused to cross the Hudson. Washington, with the troops remaining, was forced to retreat slowly across New Jersey, the British army, under Cornwallis, at his very heels, often within cannon-shot. The New Jersey people were lukewarm, and many accepted

Cornwallis's offers of amnesty. Congress, fearing that Philadelphia would be taken, adjourned to Baltimore. December 8th, Washington crossed the Delaware with less than 3,000 men. The British encamped on the opposite bank of the river. The American army was safe for the present, having secured all the boats and burned all the bridges within seventy miles.

Washington was soon re-enforced, and now had between five and six thousand troops. He determined to strike a bold blow that would electrify the drooping spirits of the army and the country. At Trenton lay a body of 1,200 Hessians. Christmas night Washington crossed the Delaware with 2,400 picked men. The current was swift, and the river full of floating ice; but the boats were handled by Massachusetts fishermen, and the passage was safely made. Then began the nine-mile march to Trenton, in a blinding storm of sleet and hail. The soldiers, many of whom were almost barefoot, stumbled on over the slippery road, shielding their muskets from the storm as best they could. Trenton was reached at eight o'clock on the morning of the 26th. An attack was made by two columns simultaneously. The surprise was complete, and after a half hour's struggle the Hessians surrendered. Nearly 1,000 prisoners were taken, besides 1,200 small arms and six guns. Washington safely retreated across the Delaware.

Cornwallis, with 7,000 men, hurried from Princeton to attack the American army. But Washington, on the night of January 2, 1777, leaving his camp-fires burning, slipped around the British

army, routed the regiments left at Princeton, and pushing on northward went into winter quarters at Morristown.

The next campaign opened late. It was the last of August when Howe, with 17,000 men, sailed from New York into Chesapeake Bay, and advanced toward Philadelphia. Washington flung himself in his path at Brandywine, September 11th, but was beaten back with heavy loss. September 26th the British army marched into Philadelphia, whence Congress had fled. October 4th, Washington attacked the British camp at Germantown. Victory was almost his when two of the attacking parties, mistaking each other, in the fog, for British, threw the movement into confusion, and Washington had to fall back, with a loss of 1,000 men.

In December the American commander led his ragged army into winter quarters at Valley Forge, twenty-one miles from Philadelphia. It was a period of deep gloom. The war had been waged now for more than two years, and less than nothing seemed to have been accomplished. Distrust of Washington's ability sprang up in some minds. "Heaven grant us one great soul!" exclaimed John Adams after Brandywine. Certain officers, envious of Washington, began to intrigue for his place.

Meanwhile the army was shivering in its log huts at Valley Forge. Nearly three thousand were barefoot. Many had to sit by the fires all night to keep from freezing. One day there was a dinner of officers to which none were admitted who had whole trousers. For days together there was no

bread in camp. The death-rate increased thirty-three per cent. from week to week.

Just now, however, amid this terrible winter at Valley Forge, Baron Steuben, a trained German soldier, who had been a pupil of Frederick the Great, joined our army. Washington made him inspector-general, and his rigorous daily drill vastly improved the discipline and the spirits of the American troops. When they left camp in the spring, spite of the hardships past, they formed a military force on which Washington could reckon with certainty for efficient work.

The British, after a gay winter in Philadelphia, startled by the news that a French fleet was on its way to America, marched for New York, June 18, 1778. The American army overtook them at Monmouth on the 28th, General Charles Lee—a traitor as we now know, and as Washington then suspected, forced into high place by influence in Congress—General Lee led the party intended to attack, but he delayed so long that the British attacked him instead.

The Americans were retreating through a narrow defile when Washington came upon the field, and his herculean efforts, brilliantly seconded by Wayne, stayed the rout. A stout stand was made, and the British were held at bay till evening, when they retired and continued their march to New York. Washington followed and took up his station at White Plains.



## CHAPTER V.

### THE NORTHERN CAMPAIGN

AT the outbreak of hostilities the thoughts of the colonists naturally turned to the Canadian border, the old battle-ground of the French and Indian War. Then and now a hostility was felt for Canada which had not slumbered since the burning of Schenectady in 1690.

May 10, 1775, Ethan Allen, at the head of a party of "Green Mountain Boys," surprised Fort Ticonderoga. Crown Point was taken two days later. Two hundred and twenty cannon, besides other much-needed military stores, fell into the hands of the Americans. Some of these heavy guns, hauled over the Green Mountains on ox-sleds the next winter, were planted by Washington on Dorchester Heights.

In November, 1775, St. Johns and Montreal were captured by a small force under General Montgomery. The Americans now seemed in a fair way to get control of all Canada, which contained only 700 regular troops. It was even hoped that Canada would make common cause with the colonies. Late in the fall Benedict Arnold led 1,000 men up the Kennebec River and through the wilderness—a terrible journey—to Quebec. Here he was joined

by Montgomery. On the night of December 30th, which was dark and stormy, Montgomery and Arnold led their joint forces, numbering some 3,000, against the city. Arnold was to attack the lower town, while Montgomery sought to gain the citadel. Montgomery had hardly passed the first line of barricades when he was shot dead, and his troops retreated in confusion. Arnold, too, was early wounded. Morgan, with 500 of his famous riflemen, forced an entrance into the lower town. But they were not re-enforced, and after a desperate street fight were taken prisoners.

A dreary and useless blockade was maintained for several months; until in May the garrison sallied forth and routed the besiegers. The British were successful in several small engagements during the summer of 1776; and the Americans finally had to fall back to Crown Point and Ticonderoga.

In June of the next year a splendid expedition set sail from St. Johns, and swept proudly up Lake Champlain. Eight thousand British and Hessian troops, under strict discipline and ably officered, forty cannon of the best make, a horde of merciless Indians—with these forces General Burgoyne, the commander of the expedition, expected to make an easy conquest of upper New York, form a junction with Clinton at Albany, and, by thus isolating New England from the Middle and Southern States, break the back of the rebellion.

Ticonderoga was the first point of attack. Sugar Loaf Mountain, which rose six hundred feet above the lake, had been neglected as too difficult of access. Burgoyne's skilful engineers easily fortified

this on the night of July 4th, and Fort Ticonderoga became untenable. General St. Clair, with his garrison of 3,000, at once evacuated it, and fled south under cover of the night. He was pursued, and his rear guard of 1,200 men was shattered. The rest of his force reached Fort Edward.

The loss of Ticonderoga spread alarm throughout the North. General Schuyler, the head of the northern department, appealed to Washington for re-enforcements, and fell back from Fort Edward to the junction of the Mohawk and Hudson.

Meanwhile Burgoyne was making a toilsome march toward Fort Edward. Schuyler had destroyed the bridges and obstructed the roads, so that the invading army was twenty-four days in going twenty-six miles. Up to this point Burgoyne's advance had been little less than a triumphal march; difficulties now began to surround him like a net.

Burgoyne had arranged for a branch expedition of 700 troops and 1,000 Indians under St. Leger, to sail up Lake Ontario, sweep across western New York, and join the main body at Albany. August 3d, this expedition reached Fort Schuyler, and besieged it. A party of 800 militia, led by General Herkimer, a veteran German soldier, while marching to relieve the fort, was surprised by an Indian ambush. The bloody battle of Oriskany followed. St. Leger's further advance was checked, and soon after, alarmed by exaggerated reports of a second relief expedition under Arnold, he hurried back to Canada.

At Bennington, twenty-five miles east of Bur-

goyne's line of march, the Americans had a depot of stores and horses. Burgoyne, who was running short of provisions, sent a body of 500 troops, under Baume, to capture these stores, and overawe the inhabitants by a raid through the Connecticut valley. About 2,000 militia hastened to the defence of Bennington. General Stark, who had fought gallantly at Bunker Hill and Trenton, took command. August 16th, Baume was attacked on three sides at once, Stark himself leading the charge against the enemy's front. Again and again his men dashed up the hill where the British lay behind breastworks. After a fight of two hours Baume surrendered, overpowered by superior numbers. Re-enforcements which came up a little later were driven back with considerable loss. The Americans took 700 prisoners and 1,000 stands of arms.

Burgoyne's situation was becoming dangerous. The failure of St. Leger and the heavy loss at Bennington seriously disarranged his plans. The troops detached to defend the posts in his rear had reduced his force to about 6,000. He was greatly hampered by lack of provisions. Meanwhile the American army had increased to 9,000. Schuyler had been supplanted by Gates, who on September 12th advanced to a strong position on Bemis Heights in the town of Stillwater. The right wing of the army rested on the Hudson, the left on ridges and wood. In front was a ravine. On the 19th Burgoyne advanced to the attack in three columns. That led by General Fraser, which tried to turn the American left, was the first to engage. Arnold's wing, including Morgan's riflemen, met Fra-

ser's skirmishers a mile from the American lines. They were soon forced to fall back; Burgoyne's central column came up, and the fight became general. The battle-ground was covered by thick woods, with occasional clearings, and the troops fought at close range. Four hours the battle raged hotly. The British artillery was taken and retaken again and again. Thirty-six of the forty-eight British gunners were either killed or wounded. At sunset the Americans withdrew to their fortified lines, leaving Burgoyne in possession of the field. It was a drawn battle, but virtually a victory for the Americans. The British lost about 600, the Americans half as many.

Burgoyne's situation was now critical in the extreme. In the heart of the enemy's country, his forces melting away while his opponents were increasing, nearly out of provisions and his connections with his base of supplies threatened by a party assailing Ticonderoga, Burgoyne's only hope was that Clinton would force a passage up the Hudson. But the latter, after capturing Forts Clinton and Montgomery early in October, fell back to the lower Hudson and left Burgoyne to his fate.

October 7th, Burgoyne advanced a picked body of 1,500 men to reconnoitre the American lines. Morgan's riflemen were sent out to "begin the game." The fighting soon became even hotter than in the previous battle. In an hour the whole British line was retreating toward the camp. At this point Arnold, whom, because of his preference for Schuyler, Gates had deprived of his command,

filled with the fury of battle, dashed upon the field and assumed his old command. The soldiers greeted him with cheers, and he led them on in one impetuous charge after another. The enemy everywhere gave way in confusion, and at dusk the Germans were even driven from their entrenched camp. The British loss was fully 600.

The next day Burgoyne retreated to Saratoga, followed by Gates. The fine army, which had set out with such high hopes only four months before, was now almost a wreck. Eight hundred were in the hospital. On the 12th the army had but five days' rations. Burgoyne could neither advance nor retreat, and on the 17th he surrendered. The army were allowed free passage to England on condition that they would not re-engage in the war. The Americans got thirty-five superb cannon and 4,000 muskets. The Sunday after the surrender, Timothy Dwight, afterward President of Yale College, preached to Gates's soldiers from Joel ii. 20, "I will remove far off from you the northern army."

Gates deserved little credit for the defeat of Burgoyne. Put forward by New England influence against Schuyler, the favorite of New York, he but reaped the results of the labors of Herkimer at Oriskany, of Stark at Bennington, and of Schuyler in obstructing Burgoyne's advance and in raising a sufficient army. Even in the two battles of Stillwater Gates did next to nothing, not even appearing on the field. Arnold and Morgan were the soul of the army on both days. Arnold's gallant conduct was at once rewarded by a major-generalship. Schuy-

ler, underrated and even maligned in his day, had to wait for the approval of posterity, which he has now fully obtained.

The surrender of Burgoyne was the most important event of the war up to that time. It was of immense service at home, raising the country out of the despondency which followed upon Brandywine and Germantown. Abroad it disheartened England, and decided France to acknowledge the independence of America and to send military aid. From the end of this year, 1777, victory over England was a practical certainty.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE SOUTHERN CAMPAIGNS

AFTER the summer of 1778 little of military importance occurred at the North. July and November of that year were marked by bloody Indian massacres at Wyoming, Pa., and Cherry Valley, N. Y., the worst in all that border warfare which was incessant from the beginning to the end of the Revolution. In August an unsuccessful attempt to regain Newport was made by General Sullivan, co-operating with a French fleet under D'Estaing. In the spring and summer of 1779, Clinton, who lay at New York with a considerable army, closely watched by Washington, sent out to Connecticut and the coasts of Virginia a number of plundering expeditions which did much damage. "Mad Anthony Wayne" led a brilliant attack against Stony Point on the Hudson, captured the British garrison, and destroyed the fortifications. This year was also marked by a great naval victory. Paul Jones lashed his vessel, the *Bonhomme Richard*, to the British *Serapis*, off the northeast coast of England, and after a desperate fight of three hours forced the *Serapis* to surrender.

But the brunt of the war now fell on the South,



where the British, unsuccessful in the Northern and Middle States, hoped for an easy conquest. The capture of Savannah in December, 1778, and of Augusta the next month, laid Georgia prostrate. The royal government was re-instated by Prevost, the British general. Our General Lincoln, who had been placed in command of the Southern army, assisted by D'Estaing with his fleet, besieged Savannah, but on October 9, 1779, was repulsed with heavy loss.

In the spring of 1780 Clinton arrived from New York with a fleet and troops. Charleston, S. C., was besieged by land and sea. Lincoln was compelled to surrender with his whole army. Beaufort, Ninety-Six, and Camden capitulated in rapid succession. Marauding expeditions overran the State. President Andrew Jackson carried to his grave scars of hurts, one on his head, another on his hand, given him by Tarleton's men when he was a boy at Waxhaw. The patriots lay helpless. The loyalists organized as militia and joined the British. Clinton, elated by success, hoped to force the entire population into allegiance to the king. The estates of patriots were sequestered. Any Carolinian found in arms against the king might be, and multitudes were, hung for treason. Clinton even issued a proclamation requiring all inhabitants to take active part on the royalist side. Sumter, Marion, and other leaders, gathering around them little companies of bold men, carried on a guerilla warfare which proved very annoying to the British. They would sally forth from their hiding-places in the swamps, surprise some British outpost or cut

off some detachment, and retreat with their booty and prisoners before pursuit could be made.

But the British army in South Carolina and Georgia was 7,000 strong. Help must come from without. And help was coming. Washington detached from his scanty army 2,000 Maryland troops and the Delaware regiment—all veterans—and sent them south under De Kalb, a brave officer of German blood, who had seen long service in France. Virginia, though herself exposed, nobly contributed arms and men. Gates, the laurels of Saratoga still fresh upon his brow, was, against Washington's judgment, appointed by Congress to succeed Lincoln.

Cornwallis, whom the return of Clinton to New York had left in command, lay at Camden, S. C. Gates, as if he had but to look the Briton in the eye to beat him, pompously assumed the offensive. On August 15th he made a night march to secure a more favorable position near Camden. Cornwallis happened to have chosen the same night for an attack upon Gates. The two armies unexpectedly met in the woods, nine miles from Camden, early in the morning of the 16th. Gates's force, increased by North Carolina militia, was between 3,000 and 4,000. Cornwallis had about 2,000. The American position was strong, a swamp protecting both flanks, but at the first bayonet charge of the British veterans the raw militia threw away their guns and "ran like a torrent." The Maryland and Delaware Continentals stood their ground bravely, but were finally obliged to retreat. De Kalb fell, with eleven wounds.

This heroic foreigner had been sent hither by Choiseul before the Revolution to report to the French minister on American affairs, and at the outbreak of war had at great cost cast in his lot with our fathers. Sent south to aid Lincoln, he arrived only in time to be utilized by Gates. De Kalb was the hero of Camden. Wounded and his horse shot from under him, on foot he led his stanch division in a charge which drove Rawdon's men and took fifty prisoners. Believing his side victorious he would not yield, though literally ridden down by Cornwallis's dragoons, till his wounds exhausted him. Two-fifths of his noble division fell with him.

The whole army was pursued for miles and completely scattered. Arms, knapsacks, broken wagons, dead horses strewed the line of retreat. The Americans lost 900 killed and as many more prisoners. The British loss was less than 500. Gates, who had been literally borne off the field by the panic-stricken militia, rode in all haste two hundred miles north to Hillsborough, N. C., where he tried to organize a new army.

The gloom created at the North by this defeat was deepened by the startling news that Benedict Arnold, the hero of Saratoga, had turned traitor. Smarting under a reprimand from Washington for misconduct, Arnold agreed with Clinton to surrender West Point. The plot was discovered by the capture of Clinton's agent, Major André, who was hung as a spy. Arnold escaped to the British lines.

There was now no organized American force in

the Carolinas, and Cornwallis began a triumphant march northward. The brave mountaineers of North Carolina and Virginia rose in arms. October 7th, a thousand riflemen fell upon a detachment of 1,100 British, strongly posted on King's Mountain, N. C., and after a sharp struggle killed and wounded about 400, and took the rest prisoners. In this battle fell one of the Tory ancestors of the since distinguished American De Pyster family. The King's Mountain victory filled the patriots with new hope and zeal, and kept the loyalists from rising to support the British. Cornwallis marched south again.

Gates was now removed and General Nathaniel Greene placed in charge of the Southern department. Greene was one of the most splendid figures in the Revolution. Son of a Rhode Island Quaker, bred a blacksmith, ill-educated save by private study, which in mathematics, history, and law he had carried far, he was in 1770 elected to the legislature of his colony. Zeal to fight England for colonial liberty lost him his place in the Friends' Society. Heading Rhode Island's contingent to join Washington before Boston at the first shock of Revolutionary arms, he was soon made brigadier, the initial step in his rapid promotion. Showing himself an accomplished fighter at Trenton, Princeton, Germantown, Monmouth, and the battle of Rhode Island, and a first-rate organizer as quartermaster-general of the army, he had long been Washington's right-hand man; and his superior now sent him south with high hopes and ringing words of recommendation to the army and people there.

Greene's plan of campaign was the reverse of Gates's. He meant to harass and hinder the enemy at every step, avoiding pitched battles. January 17, 1781, a portion of his army, about 1,000 strong, under the famous General Daniel Morgan, of Virginia, another hero of Saratoga, was attacked at Cowpens, S. C., by an equal number of British under the dashing Tarleton. The British, riddled by a terrible cross-fire from Morgan's unerring riflemen, followed up by a bayonet charge, fled, and were for twenty-four miles pursued by cavalry. The American loss was trifling. Tarleton lost 300 in killed and wounded, and 500 prisoners, besides 100 horses, 35 wagons, and 800 muskets.

Cornwallis began a second march northward. Greene's force was too weak to risk a battle. His soldiers were poorly clad, and most of them were without tents or shoes. He therefore skilfully retreated across North Carolina, chased by Cornwallis. Twice the rivers, rising suddenly after Greene had crossed, checked his pursuers. But on March 15th, re-enforced to about 4,000, the Quaker general offered battle to Cornwallis at Guilford Court-House, N. C. He drew up his forces on a wooded hill in three lines one behind the other. The first line, consisting of raw North Carolina militia, fled before the British bayonet charge, hardly firing a shot. The Virginia brigade constituting the second line made a brave resistance, but was soon driven back. On swept the British columns, flushed with victory, against the third line. Here Greek met Greek. The Continentals stood their ground like the veterans they

were. After a long and bloody fight the British were driven back. The fugitives, however, presently rallied under cover of the artillery, when Greene, fearing to risk more, withdrew from the field. The British lost 500; the Americans, 400, besides a large part of the militia, who dispersed to their homes. Cornwallis, with his "victorious but ruined army," retreated to the southern part of the State. The last of April he forsook Carolina, and marched into Virginia with 1,400 men.

Greene, his force reduced to 1,800, carried the war into South Carolina. Defeated at Hobkirk's Hill, near Camden, and compelled by the approach of General Rawdon to raise the siege of Ninety-Six, he retreated north. Meantime Marion and Lee had brought about the evacuation of Camden and Augusta. Rawdon soon evacuated Ninety-Six, and moved toward the coast, followed by Greene.

A ceaseless guerilla warfare was kept up, attended with many barbarities. Slave-stealing was a favorite pursuit on both sides. It is noteworthy that the followers of Sumter, fighting in the cause of freedom, were paid largely in slaves. The whole campaign was marked by severities unknown at the North. The British shot as deserters all who, having once accepted royal protection, were taken in arms against the king. In a few cases Americans dealt similarly with Americans fighting for the British, but in general their procedure was infinitely the more humane.

The battle of Eutaw Springs practically ended the war in the South. The British were victorious,

but all the advantages of the battle accrued to the Americans. The British loss was nearly 1,000; the American, 600. In ten months Greene had driven the British from all Georgia and the Carolinas except Wilmington, Charleston, and Savannah.

Destiny decreed that Washington should strike the last blow for his country's freedom on the soil of his own State. Cornwallis found himself in Virginia, the last of May, at the head of 7,000 troops. He ravaged the State, destroying \$10,000,000 worth of property. Lafayette, pitted against him with 3,000 men, could do little. In August Cornwallis withdrew into Yorktown, and began fortifications. Lafayette's quick eye saw that the British general had caged himself. Posting his army so as to prevent Cornwallis's escape, he advised Washington to hasten with his army to Virginia. Meanwhile a French fleet blocked up the mouth of Chesapeake Bay and of James River and York River, cutting off Cornwallis's escape by water. The last of September Washington's army, accompanied by the French troops under Rochambeau, appeared before Yorktown. Clinton, deceived by Washington into the belief that New York was to be attacked, was still holding that city with 18,000 men. The American army, 16,000 strong—7,000 French—began a regular siege. Cornwallis was doomed.

Two advanced redoubts of the British works were soon carried by a brilliant assault in which the French and the American troops won equal honors. On the 19th Cornwallis surrendered. The captive army, numbering 7,247, marched with cased colors

between two long lines of American and French troops, and laid down their arms.

The news of Cornwallis's surrender flew like wild-fire over the country. Everywhere the victory was hailed as virtually ending the war. Bonfires and booming cannon told of the joy of the people. Congress assembled, and marching to church in a body, not as a mere form, we may well believe, gave thanks to the God of battles, so propitious at last.



## CHAPTER VII.

### PEACE

THE peace party and spirit in England increased month by month. Burgoyne's surrender had dissipated the hope of speedily suppressing the rebellion. And as the war dragged on and Englishmen by bitter experience came to realize the bravery, endurance, and national feeling of the Americans, the conviction spread that three millions of such people, separated from the mother-country by three thousand miles of boisterous ocean, could never be conquered by force. Discouragement arose, too, from the ill conduct of the war. There was no broad plan or consistency in management. Generals did not agree or co-operate, and were changed too often. Clinton and Cornwallis hated each other. Burgoyne superseded Carleton, a better man. But for Lord Germain's "criminal negligence" in waiting to go upon a visit before sending the proper orders, Clinton might have met and saved Burgoyne.

There were enormous and needless expenses. By 1779 England's national debt had increased £63,000,000; by 1782 it had doubled. Rents were declining. The price of land had fallen one-third. Hence the war became unpopular with the

landed aristocracy. British manufacturers suffered by the narrowing of their foreign markets. American privateers, prowling in all seas, had captured hundreds of British merchantmen. English sentiment, too, revolted at certain features of the war. Ravaging and the use of mercenaries and Indians were felt to be barbarous. Time made clearer the initial error of the government in invoking war over the doubtful right of taxing America. An increasing number of lawyers took the American view. Practical men figured out that each year of hostilities cost more than the proposed tax would have yielded in a century.

In February, 1778, Parliament almost unanimously adopted proposals to restore the state of things which existed in America before the war, at the same time declaring its intention not to exercise its right of taxing the colonies. Washington spoke for America when he said, "Nothing but independence will now do." The proposals were rejected by Congress and by the States separately.

England's difficulties were greatly increased by the help extended to America from abroad. France, eager for revenge on England, early in the war lent secret aid by money and military supplies. Later, emboldened by the defeat of Burgoyne, the French Government recognized the United States as an independent nation. By a treaty, offensive and defensive, the two nations bound themselves to fight together for that independence, neither to conclude a separate peace.

The benefit from this treaty was moral and financial rather than martial. At Yorktown, to be sure,

the French forces rendered invaluable aid. Without De Grasse's French fleet at the mouths of the York and James rivers, the British might have relieved Cornwallis by sea. But Congress needed money more than foreign soldiers, and without France's liberal loans it is difficult to see how the government could have struggled through.

Spain, too, joined the alliance of France and the United States and declared war against England, though from no love for the young republic. This action hastened the growth of public opinion in England against the continuance of the American war. In the House of Commons, Lord Cavendish made a motion for ordering home the troops. Lord North, prime minister, threw out hints that it was useless to continue the war. But George III., summoning his ministers, declared his unchanging resolution never to yield to the rebels, and continued prodding the wavering North to stumble on in his stupid course.

It was struggling against fate. The next year saw Holland at war with England, while Catherine, Empress of Russia, was actively organizing the Armed Neutrality, by which all the other states of Europe leagued together to resist England's practice of stopping vessels on the high seas and searching them for contraband goods.

England was now involved in four wars, without money to carry them on. North's majorities in Parliament grew steadily smaller. No doubt much of the opposition was simply factious and partisan, but it had, after all, solid basis in principle. England was fighting her own policy—eco-

nominally, for she was destined to free trade, and politically, inasmuch as the freedom which our fathers sought was nothing but English freedom.

The surrender of Cornwallis tipped the scale. Lord North, when he heard the news, paced the room in agony, exclaiming again and again, "O God, it is all over!" The House of Commons, without even a division, resolved to "consider as enemies to His Majesty and the country" all who should advise a further prosecution of the war. North resigned, and Shelburne, Secretary of State in the new ministry, hastened to open peace negotiations with Franklin at Paris.

Benjamin Franklin, now venerable with years, had been doing at the court of Versailles a work hardly less important than that of Washington on the battle-fields of America. By the simple grace and dignity of his manners, by his large good sense and freedom of thought, by his fame as a scientific discoverer, above all by his consummate tact in the management of men, the whilom printer, king's postmaster-general for America, discoverer, London colonial agent, delegate in the Continental Congress, and signer of the Declaration of Independence, had completely captivated elegant, free-thinking France. Learned and common folk, the sober and the frivolous alike swore by Franklin. Snuff-boxes, furniture, dishes, even stoves were gotten up *à la Franklin*. The old man's portrait was in every house. That the French Government, in spite of a monarch who was half afraid of the rising nation beyond sea, had given America her hearty support, was in no

small measure due to the influence of Franklin. And his skill in diplomacy was of the greatest value in the negotiations now pending.

These were necessarily long and tedious, but Jay, Franklin's colleague, made them needlessly so by his finical refusal to treat till England had acknowledged our independence by a separate act. This, indeed, jeopardized peace itself, since Shelburne's days of ministerial power were closing, and his successor was sure to be less our friend. Jay at last receded, a compromise being arrived at by which the treaty was to open with a virtual recognition of independence in acknowledging Adams, Franklin, and Jay as "plenipotentiaries," that is, agents of a sovereign power. Boundaries, fishery rights, and the treatment of loyalists and their property were the chief bones of contention.

As the negotiations wore on it became apparent that Spain and France, now that their vengeance was sated against England by our independence, were more unfriendly to our territorial enlargement than England itself. There still exists a map on which Spain's minister had indicated what he wished to make our western bound. The line follows nearly the meridian of Pittsburgh. This attitude of those powers excused our plenipotentiaries, though bound by our treaty with France not to conclude peace apart from her, for making the preliminary arrangements with England privately. At last, on November 30, 1782, Franklin, Jay, and John Adams set their signatures to preliminary articles, which were incorporated in a treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States, France,

and Spain, signed at Paris on September 3, 1783. David Hartley signed for England. Our Congress ratified on February 14, 1784.

The treaty recognized the independence of the United States. It established as boundaries nearly the present Canadian line on the north, the Mississippi on the west, and Florida, which now returned to Spain and extended to the Mississippi, on the south. Despite the wishes of Spain, the free navigation of the Mississippi, from source to mouth, was guaranteed to the United States and Great Britain. Fishery rights received special attention. American fishermen were granted the privilege of fishing, as before the war, on the banks of Newfoundland, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and in all other places in the sea where the inhabitants of both countries had been accustomed to fish. Liberty was also granted to take fish on such parts of the coast of Newfoundland as British fishermen should use, and on the coasts, bays, and creeks of all other British dominions in America. American fishermen could dry and cure fish on the unsettled parts of Nova Scotia, Labrador, and the Magdalen Islands. America agreed, for the protection of British creditors, that debts contracted before the war should be held valid, and should be payable in sterling money. It was also stipulated that Congress should earnestly recommend to the several States the restitution of all confiscated property belonging to loyalists.

Peace came like a heavenly benediction to the country and the army, exhausted by so long and so fierce a struggle. No general engagement took

place after the siege of Yorktown ; but the armies kept close watch upon each other, and minor skirmishes were frequent. Washington's 10,000 men were encamped near the Hudson, to see that Clinton's forces in New York did no harm. In the South, Greene's valiant band, aided by Wayne and his rangers, without regular food or pay, kept the British cooped up in Charleston and Augusta.

Congress in due time declared cessation of hostilities, and on April 19, 1783, just eight years from the battle of Lexington, Washington read the declaration at the head-quarters of his army. The British had evacuated Charleston the previous December. In July, Savannah saw the last of the redcoats file out, and the British troops were collected at New York. On November 25th, Sir Guy Carleton, who had superseded Clinton, embarked with his entire army, besides a throng of refugees, in boats for Long Island and Staten Island, where they soon took ship for England. "The imperial standard of Great Britain fell at the fort over which it had floated for a hundred and twenty years, and in its place the Stars and Stripes of American Independence flashed in the sun. Fleet and army, royal flag and scarlet uniform, coronet and ribbon, every sign and symbol of foreign authority, which from Concord to Saratoga, and from Saratoga to Yorktown had sought to subdue the colonies, vanished from these shores. Colonial and provincial America had ended, national America had begun."

The American troops took possession of New York amid the huzzas of the people and the roar

of cannon. On November 25th Washington with his suite, surrounded by grateful and admiring throngs, made a formal entry into the city whence he had been compelled to flee seven years before.

The time had now come when the national hero might lay down the great burden which he had borne with herculean strength and courage through so many years of distress and gloom. On December 4th he joined his principal officers at the popular Fraunces's Tavern, near the Battery, to bid them farewell. Tears filled every eye. Even Washington could not master his feelings, as one after another the heroes who had been with him upon the tented field and in so many moments of dreadful strife drew near to press his hand. They followed him through ranks of parading infantry to the Whitehall ferry, where he boarded his barge, and waving his hat in a last, voiceless farewell, crossed to the Jersey shore.

Arrived at Annapolis after a journey which had been one long ovation, the saviour of his country appeared before Congress, December 23d, to resign the commission which he had so grandly fulfilled. His address was in noble key, but abbreviated by choking emotion. The President of Congress having replied in fitting words, Washington withdrew, and continued his journey to the long-missed peace and seclusion of his Mount Vernon home.



## CHAPTER VIII.

### AMERICAN MANHOOD IN THE REVOLUTION

It would be foolish to say that the revolutionary soldiers never quailed. Militia too often gave way before the steady bayonet charge of British regulars, at times fleeing panic-stricken. Troops whose term of service was out would go home at critical moments. Hardships and lack of pay in a few instances led to mutiny and desertion. But the marvel is that they fought so bravely, endured so much, and complained so little. One reason was the patriotism of the people at large behind them. Soldiers who turned their backs on Boston, leaving Washington in the lurch, were refused food along the road home. Women placed rifles in the hands of husbands, sons, or lovers, and said "Go!"

The rank and file in this war, coming from farm, work-bench, logging-camp, or fisher's boat, had a superb physical basis for camp and field life. Used to the rifle from boyhood, they kept their powder dry and made every one of their scanty bullets tell. The revolutionary soldier's splendid courage has glorified a score of battle-fields; while Valley Forge, with its days of hunger and nights of cold, its sick-beds on the damp ground, and its

bloody footprints in the snow, tell of his patient endurance.

At Bunker Hill an undisciplined body of farmers, ill-armed, weary, hungry and thirsty, calmly awaited the charge of old British campaigners, and by a fire of dreadful precision drove them back. "They may talk of their Mindens and their Fontenoy's," said the British general, Howe, "but there was no such fire there." At Charleston, while the wooden fort shook with the British broadsides, Moultrie and his South Carolina boys, half naked in the stifling heat, through twelve long hours smoked their pipes and carefully pointed their guns. At Long Island, to gain time for the retreat of the rest, five Maryland companies flew again and again in the face of the pursuing host. At Monmouth eight thousand British were in hot pursuit of the retreating Americans. Square in their front Washington planted two Pennsylvania and Maryland regiments, saying, "Gentlemen, I depend upon you to hold the ground until I can form the main army." And hold it they did.

Heroism grander than that of the battle-field, which can calmly meet an ignominious death, was not lacking. Captain Nathan Hale, a quiet, studious spirit, just graduated from Yale College, volunteered to enter the British lines on Long Island as a spy. He was caught, and soon swung from an apple-tree in Colonel Rutgers' orchard, a corpse. Bible and religious ministrations denied him, his letters to mother and sister destroyed, women standing by and sobbing, he met his fate without a tremor. "I only regret," comes his

voice from yon rude scaffold, "that I have but one life to give for my country." It is a shame that America so long had no monument to this heroic man. One almost rejoices that the British captain, Cunningham, author of the cruelty to Hale, himself met death on the gallows, in London, 1791. How different from Hale's the treatment bestowed upon André, the British spy who fell into our hands. He was fed from Washington's table and supported to his execution by every manifestation of sympathy for his suffering.

The stanch and useful loyalty of the New England clergy in the Revolution has been much dwelt upon—none too much, however. With them should be mentioned the Rev. James Caldwell, Presbyterian pastor at Elizabeth, N. J., who, when English soldiers raided the town, and its defenders were short of wadding, tore up his hymn-book for their use, urging: "Give them Watts, boys, give them Watts."

No fiercer naval battle was ever fought than when Jones, in the old and rotten *Bonhomme Richard*, grappled with the new British frigate *Serapis*. Yard-arm to yard-arm, port-hole to port-hole, the fight raged for hours. Three times both vessels were on fire. The *Serapis's* guns tore a complete breach in the *Richard* from mainmast to stern. The *Richard* was sinking, but the intrepid Jones fought on, and the *Serapis* struck.

As the roll of revolutionary officers is called, what matchless figures file past the mind's eye. We see stalwart Ethan Allen entering *Ticonderoga* too early in the morning to find its com-

mander in a presentable condition, and demanding possession "in the name of Almighty God and the Continental Congress"—destined, himself, in a few months, to be sailing down the St. Lawrence in irons, bound for long captivity in England. We behold gallant Prescott leisurely promenading the Bunker Hill parapet to inspire his men, shot and shell hurtling thick around. There is Israel Putnam—"Old Put" the boys dubbed him. He was no general, but we forgive his costly blunders at Brooklyn Heights and Peekskill as we think of him leaving plough in furrow at the drum-beat to arms, and speeding to the deadly front at Boston, or with iron firmness stemming the retreat from Bunker Hill. Young Richard Montgomery might have been next to Washington in the war but for Sir Guy Carleton's deadly grape-shot from the Quebec walls the closing moments of 1775. Buried at Quebec, his remains were transferred by the State of New York, July 8, 1818, to their present resting-place in front of St. Paul's, New York City, the then aged widow tearfully watching the funeral barge as it floated past Montgomery Place on the Hudson.

During a four years' apprenticeship under Washington, General Greene had caught more of his master's spirit and method than did any other American leader, and one year's separate command at the South gave him a martial fame second only to Washington's own. In him the great chief's word was fulfilled, "I send you a general." A naked, starving army, an empty military chest, the surrounding country impoverished and full of loy-

alists—these were his difficulties. Three States practically cleared of the royal army in ten months—this was his achievement. He retreated only to advance, was beaten only to fight again. One hardly knows which to admire most, his tireless energy and vigilance, his prudence in retreat, his boldness and vigor in attack, his cheerful courage in defeat, or his mingled kindness and firmness toward a suffering and mutinous army.

John Stark, eccentric but true, famous for cool courage—how stubbornly, with his New Hampshire boys, he held the rail fence at Bunker Hill, and covered the retreat when ammunition was gone! But Stark's most brilliant deed was at Bennington. "There they are, boys—the red-coats, and by night they're ours, or Molly Stark's a widow." Those "boys," without bayonets, their artillery shooting stones for balls, were little more than a mob. But with confidence in him, on they rush, up, over, sweeping Baume's Hessians from the field like a tornado. The figure of General Schuyler comes before us—quieter but not less noble, an invalid, set to hard tasks with little glory. His magnanimous soul forgets self in country as he cheerfully gives all possible help to Gates, his supplanter, and puts the torch to his own grain-fields at Saratoga lest they feed the foe.

And matchless Dan Morgan of Virginia, with his band of riflemen, tall, sinewy fellows, in hunting-shirts, leggins, and moccasins, each with hatchet, hunter's knife, and rifle, dead sure to hit a man's head every time at two hundred and fifty yards. It was one of these men who shot the gallant

Briton, Fraser, at Bemis's Heights. Morgan became the ablest leader of light troops then living. How gallantly he headed the forlorn hope under the icy walls of Quebec, where he was taken prisoner, and at Saratoga with his shrill whistle and stentorian voice called his dauntless braves where the fight was thickest! But Cowpens was Morgan's crowning feat. Inspiring militia and veterans alike with a courage they had never felt before, he routs Tarleton's trained band of horse, and then, skilful in retreat as he had been bold in fight, laughs at baffled Cornwallis's rage.

Gladly would one form fuller acquaintance with other revolutionary leaders: Stirling, Sullivan, Sumter, Mad Anthony Wayne, of Monmouth and Stony Point fame, Glover with his brave following of Marblehead fishermen, who, able to row as well as shoot, manned the oars that critical night when General Washington crossed to Trenton. But space is too brief. Colonel Washington, the dashing cavalryman, was the Custer of the Revolution. All the patriot ladies idolized him. In a hot sword-fight with the Colonel, Tarleton had had three fingers nearly severed. Subsequently in conversation with a South Carolina lady Tarleton said: "Why do you ladies so lionize Colonel Washington? He is an ignorant fellow. He can hardly write his name." "But you are a witness that he can make his mark," was the reply.

DeKalb was an American, too—by adoption. It is related that he expostulated with Gates for fighting so unprepared at Camden, and that Gates intimated cowardice. "To-morrow will tell, sir, who

is the coward," the old fellow rejoined. And tomorrow did tell. As the battle reddened, exit Gates from Camden and from history. We have recounted elsewhere how like a bull DeKalb held the field. A monster British grenadier rushed on him, bayonet fixed. DeKalb parried, at the same time burying his sword in the grenadier's breast so deep that he was unable to extract it. Then seizing the dead man's weapon he fought on, thrusting right and left, till at last, overpowered by numbers, he slipped and fell, mortally hurt.

Among the civilian heroes of the Revolution, Robert Morris, the financier, deserves exceeding praise. Now turning over the lead ballast of his ships for bullets, now raising \$50,000 on his private credit and sending it to Washington in the nick of time, now leading the country back to specie payment in season to save the national credit, the Philadelphia banker aided the cause as much as the best general in the field.

Faithful and successful envoys as Jay and John Adams were, the Revolution brought to light one, and only one, true master in the difficult art of diplomacy—Franklin. Wise with a lifetime's shrewd observation, venerable with years, preceded by his fame as scientist and revolutionary statesman, grand in his plain dignity, the Philadelphia printer stood unabashed before the throne of France, and carried king and diplomats with an art that surprised Europe's best-trained courtiers. Never missing an opportunity, he yet knew, by delicate intuition, when to speak and when to hold his tongue. Through concession, intrigue, and delay,

his resolute will kept steady to its purpose. To please by yielding is easy. To carry one's point and be pleasing still, requires genius. This Franklin did—how successfully, our treaty of alliance with France and our treaty of peace with England splendidly attested.

Towering above revolutionary soldier, general, and statesman stands a figure summing up in himself all these characters and much more. That figure is George Washington, the most perfect human personality the world has known. Washington's military ability has been much underrated. He was hardly more First in Peace than First in War. That he had physical courage and could give orders calmly while bullets whizzed all about, one need not repeat. He was strategist and tactician too. Trenton and Yorktown do not cover his whole military record. With troops inferior in every single respect except natural valor, he outgeneralled Howe in 1776, and he almost never erred when acting upon his own good judgment instead of yielding to Congress or to his subordinates. His movements on the Delaware even such a captain as Frederick the Great declared "the most brilliant achievements in the annals of military action." Washington advised against the attempt to hold Fort Mifflin, which failed; against the Canada campaign, which failed; against Gates for commander in the South, who failed; and in favor of Greene for that post, who succeeded. His army was indeed driven back in several battles, but never broken up. At Monmouth his plan was perfect, and it seems that he must have captured



Clinton but for the treason of Charles Lee, set, by Congress's wish, to command the van. Indeed, of Washington's military career, "take it all in all, its long duration, its slender means, its vast theatre, its glorious aims and results, there is no parallel in history."\*

Yet we are right in never thinking of the Great Man first as a soldier, he was so much besides. Washington's consummate intellectual trait was sound judgment, only matched by the magnificent balance which subsisted between his mental and his moral powers. "George had always been a good son," his mother said. Nature had endowed him with intense passions and ambitions, but neither could blind him or swerve him one hair from the line of rectitude as he saw it. And he made painful and unremitting effort to see it and see it correctly. He was approachable, but repelled familiarity, and whoever attempted this was met with a perfectly withering look. He rarely laughed, and he was without humor, though he wrote and conversed well. He had the integrity of Aristides. His account with Congress while general shows scrupulousness to the uttermost farthing. To subordinate, to foe, even to malicious plotters against him, he was almost guiltily magnanimous. He loved popularity, yet, if conscious that he was right, would face public murmuring with heart of flint. Become the most famous man alive, idolized at home, named by every tongue in Europe, praised by kings and great ministers, who compared him with Cæsar, Charlemagne, and Alfred

\* Winthrop, Washington Monument Oration, February 23, 1835.

the Great, his head swam not, but with steadfast heart and mind he moved on in the simple pursuit of his country's weal. "In Washington's career," said Fisher Ames, "mankind perceived some change in their ideas of greatness; the splendor of power, and even the name of conqueror had grown dim in their eyes." Lord Erskine wrote him: "You are the only being for whom I have an awful reverence." "Until time shall be no more," said Lord Brougham, "will a test of the progress which our race has made in Wisdom and Virtue be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington." And Mr. Gladstone: "If among all the pedestals supplied by history for public characters of extraordinary nobility and purity I saw one higher than all the rest, and if I were required at a moment's notice to name the fittest occupant for it, my choice would light upon WASHINGTON."\*

\* See Winthrop's Oration for these and other encomia.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE OLD CONFEDERATION

THE revolutionary Congress was less a government than an exigency committee. It had no authority save in tacit general consent. Need of an express and permanent league was felt at an early date. Articles of Confederation, framed by Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, were adopted by Congress in November, 1777. They were then submitted to the State Legislatures for ratification. By the spring of 1779 all the States but Maryland had given their approval. Upon the accession of the latter, on March 1, 1781, the articles went into effect at once.

The Confederation bound the States together into a "firm league of friendship" for common defence and welfare, and this "union" was to be "perpetual." Each State retained its "sovereignty" and "independence," as well as every power not "expressly delegated" to the central Government. Inhabitants of each State were entitled to all the privileges of citizens in the several States. Criminals fleeing from one State to another were to be returned.

Congress was composed of delegates chosen annually, each State being represented by not less

than two or more than seven. Each State had but one vote, whatever the number of its delegates.

Taxation and the regulation of commerce were reserved to the State Governments. On the other hand, Congress alone could declare peace or war, make treaties, coin money, establish a post-office, deal with Indians outside of the States, direct the army, and appoint generals and naval officers. Many other things affecting all the States alike Congress alone could do. It was to erect courts for trial of felonies and piracies on the high seas, and appoint judges for the settlement of disputes between the States. It was to make estimates for national expenses, and request of each State its quota of revenue.

To amend the Articles, the votes of the entire thirteen States were demanded. Important lesser measures—such as those regarding war or peace, treaties, coinage, loans, appropriations—required the consent of nine States. Upon other questions a majority was sufficient. A committee, composed of one delegate from each State, was to sit during the recess of Congress, having the general superintendence of national affairs.

The faults of the Confederation were numerous and great. Three outshadowed the rest: Congress could not enforce its will, could not collect a revenue, could not regulate commerce.

Congress could not touch individuals; it must act through the State Governments, and these it had no power to coerce. Five States, for instance, passed laws which violated the treaty provision

about payment of British creditors; yet Congress could do nothing but remonstrate. Hence its power to make treaties was almost a nullity. European nations did not wish to treat with a Government that could not enforce its promises.

Congress could make requisition upon the States for revenue, but had no authority to collect a single penny. The States complied or not as they chose. In October, 1781, Congress asked for \$8,000,000; in January, 1783, it had received less than half a million. Lack of revenue made the Government continually helpless and often contemptible.

Yet in spite of their looseness and other faults, the adoption of the Articles of Confederation was a forward step in American public law. Their greatest value was this: they helped to keep before the States the thought of union, while at the same time, by their very inefficiency, they proved the need of a stronger government to make union something more than a thought. The years immediately after the war were an extremely critical period. The colonies had indeed passed through the Red Sea, but the wilderness still lay before them. The great danger which had driven them into union being past, state pride and jealousy broke out afresh. "My State," not "my country," was the foremost thought in most minds. There was serious danger that each State would go its own way, and firm union come, if at all, only after years of weakness and disaster, if not of war. The unfriendly nations of Europe were eagerly anticipating such result. At this juncture

the Articles of Confederation, framed during the war when union was felt to be imperative, did invaluable service. They solemnly committed the States to perpetual union. Their provisions for extradition of criminals and for inter-state citizenship helped to break down the barriers between State and State. Congress, by discharging its various duties on behalf of all the States, kept steadily before the public mind the idea of a national government, armed with at least a semblance of authority.

The war had cost about \$150,000,000. In 1783 the debt was \$42,000,000—\$8,000,000 owed in France and Holland, and the rest at home. The States contributed in so niggardly a way that even the interest could not be paid. Five millions were owing to the army. Deep and ominous discontent spread among officers and men. An obscure colonel, supposed to be the agent of more prominent men, wrote to Washington, advocating a monarchy as the only salvation for the country, and inviting him to become king. In the spring of 1783 an anonymous address, of menacing tone, was circulated in the army, calling upon it for measures to force its rights from an ungrateful country.

That the army disbanded quietly at last, with only three months' pay, in certificates depreciated nine-tenths, was due almost wholly to the boundless influence of Washington. How powerless the Government would have been to resist an uprising of the army was shown by a humiliating incident. In June, 1783, a handful of Pennsylvania troops, clamoring for their pay, besieged the doors of

Congress and that august body had to take refuge in precipitate flight.

The country suffered greatly for lack of uniform commercial laws. So long as each State laid its own imposts, and goods free of duty in one State might be practically excluded from another, Congress could negotiate no valuable treaties of commerce abroad.

The chief immediate distress was from this wretchedness of our commercial relations, whether foreign or between the States at home. If our fathers would be independent, king and parliament were determined to make them pay dearly for the privilege. Accordingly Great Britain laid tariffs upon all our exports thither. What was much harder to bear, an order of the king in council, July 2, 1783, utterly forbade American ships to engage in that British West-Indian trade which had always been a chief source of our wealth. The sole remedy for these abuses in dealing with England at that time was retaliation, but Congress had no authority to take retaliatory steps, while the separate States could not or would not act sufficiently in harmony to do so. If one imposed customs duties, another would open wide its ports, filling the markets of the first with British goods by overland trade, so that the customs law of the first availed nothing. If Pennsylvania and New York laid tariffs on foreign commodities, New Jersey and Connecticut people, in buying imported articles from Philadelphia or New York, were paying taxes to those greater States. North Carolina was in the same manner a forced tributary to South

Carolina and Virginia, as were portions of Connecticut and Massachusetts to Rhode Island.

We also needed a complete system of courts, departments for foreign and Indian affairs, and an efficient executive. The single vote for each State was unfair, allowing one-third of the people to defeat the will of the rest. The article requiring the consent of nine States made it almost impossible to get important measures through Congress. Delegates should not have been paid by their respective States. In consequence of this provision, coupled with other things, Congress decreased in numbers and importance. In November, 1783, less than twenty delegates were present, representing but seven States, and Congress had to appeal to the recreant States to send back their representatives before the treaty of peace could be ratified.

But the one grand defect of the Confederation, underlying all others, was lack of power. The Government was an engine without steam. The States, just escaped from the tyranny of a king, would brook no new authority strong enough to endanger their liberties. The result was a thin ghost of a government set in charge over a lot of lusty flesh-and-blood States.

The Confederation, however, did one piece of solid work worthy of everlasting praise. The Northwest Territory, embracing what is now Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, had been ceded to the Union by the States which originally claimed it. July 13, 1787, Congress adopted for the government of the territory the famous Ordinance of



1787. It provided for a governor, council, and judges, to be appointed by Congress, and a house of representatives elected by the people. Its shining excellence was a series of compacts between the States and the territory, which guaranteed religious liberty, made grants of land and other liberal provisions for schools and colleges, and forever prohibited slavery in the territory or the States which should be made out of it. Thus were laid broad and deep the foundation for the full and free development of humanity in a region larger than the whole German Empire.

The passing of the Ordinance was probably due in large measure to the influence of the Ohio Company, a colonist society organized in Boston the year before. It was composed of the flower of the revolutionary army, and had wealth, energy, and intelligence. When its agent appeared before Congress to arrange for the purchase of five million acres of land in the Ohio Valley, a bill for the government of the territory, containing neither the anti-slavery clause nor the immortal principles of the compacts, was on the eve of passage. The Company, composed mostly of Massachusetts men, strongly desired their future home to be upon free soil. Their influence prevailed with Congress, eager for revenue from the sale of lands, and even the Southern members voted unanimously for the remodelled ordinance. The establishment of a strong and enlightened government in the territory led to its rapid settlement. Marietta, O., was founded in April, 1788, and other colonies followed in rapid succession.

## CHAPTER X.

### RISE OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION

THE anarchy succeeding the Revolution was as sad as the Revolution itself had been glorious. The Articles of Confederation furnished practically no government with which foreign nations could deal; England still clung to the western posts, contrary to the treaty of peace, with no power anywhere on this side to do more than protest; the debt of the Confederacy steadily piled up its unpaid interest; the land was flooded with irredeemable paper money, state and national; the confederacy's laws and constitution were ignored or trampled upon everywhere; and the arrogance and self-seeking of the several States surpassed everything but their own contemptible weakness.

In 1786 Shays' rebellion broke out in Massachusetts. Solid money was very scarce, and paper all but worthless, yet many debts contracted on a paper basis were pressed for payment in hard money. The farmers swore that the incidence of taxes upon them was excessive, and upon the merchants too light. But the all-powerful grievance was the sudden change from the distressing monetary injustice during the Revolution, with the consequent increase of debts, to a rigid enforcement of debtors' claims afterward. At this period men were imprisoned for

debt, and all prisons were frightful holes, which one would as lief die as enter. Meetings were held to air the popular griefs, and grew violent.

In August the court house at Northampton was seized by a body of armed men and the court prevented from sitting. Similar uprisings occurred at Worcester, Springfield, and Concord. The leader in these movements was Daniel Shays, a former captain in the continental army. Governor Bowdoin finally called for volunteers to put down the rebellion, and placed General Lincoln in command. After several minor engagements, in which the insurgents were worsted, the decisive action took place at Petersham, where, in February, 1787, the rebels were surprised by Lincoln. A large number were captured, many more fled to their homes, and the rest withdrew into the neighboring States. Vermont and Rhode Island alone offered them a peaceful retreat, the other States giving up the fugitives to Massachusetts.

The Shays commotion, for a long time shaking one of the stanchest States in the Confederation, well showed the need of a far stronger central government than the old had been or could be made. Other influences concurred to the same conviction. Washington's influence, which took effect mainly through his inspired letter to the States on leaving the army, was one of these. National feeling was also furthered by the spread of two religious sects, the Baptists and the Methodists, up and down the continent, whose missionary preachers, ignoring state lines and prejudices, helped to destroy the latter in their hearers.

During the Revolution, American Methodism had been an appanage of England. Wesley had discountenanced our effort at independence, and when war broke out, all the Methodist preachers left the country, save Asbury, who secreted himself somewhere in Delaware, waiting for better days. But in 1784 this zealous body of Christians was organized as an American affair, its clergy and laity after this displaying loyalty of the most approved kind.

Schemes had been mooted looking to a changed political order. A proposition for a convention of the States to reform the Confederation passed the New York Legislature in July, 1782, under the influence of Alexander Hamilton; another passed that of Massachusetts, July, 1785, urged by Governor Bowdoin; but because of too great love for state independence and too little appreciation as yet of the serious nature of the crisis, both motions failed of effect.

The idea of reform which found most favor, the only one which at first had any chance of getting itself realized, was that of giving Congress simply the additional power of regulating commerce. Even so moderate a proposal as this had many enemies, especially in the South. Greatly to her credit therefore as a Southern State, the purpose of amending the old articles in the direction indicated was first taken up in earnest by Virginia. Her Legislature, soon after opening session in October, 1785, listened to memorials from Norfolk, Suffolk, Portsmouth, and Alexandria, upon the gloomy prospects of American trade, which led to a general de-

bate upon the subject. In this, Mr. Madison, by a speech far exceeding in ability any other that was made, began that extended and memorable career of efforts for enlarged function in our central government which has earned him the title of the Father of the Constitution.

The result of this discussion was a bill directing the Virginia delegation in Congress to propose amendment to the constitution giving to Congress the needed additional power. The enemies of the bill, however, succeeded in so modifying it by limiting the proposed grant of power to a period of thirteen years, that Madison and its other abettors turned against it and voted to lay it on the table.

There was in existence at this very time a joint commission representing Virginia and Maryland, which had been raised for the purpose of determining what jurisdiction each of the two States had over the Potomac and in Chesapeake Bay. Madison was one of the Virginia commissioners. A meeting had been held on March 17, 1785, at which the commissioners agreed in their report to transcend their instructions and to recommend to the two States uniform monetary and commercial regulations entire, including common export and import duties. They thus reported, adding the still further recommendation that commissioners to work out the details of such a plan be appointed each year till it should be completed. The Maryland Legislature adopted the report, adding the proposition that Delaware and Pennsylvania also should be invited to enter the system and to send commissioners.

When the commissioners' report, with Maryland's action thereon, came before the Virginia Legislature, Madison moved, as a substitute for the mutilated bill which had been tabled previously, that the invitation to take part in the commission go to *all* the States. The motion passed by a large majority.

Thus originated the Annapolis Convention of 1786. Nine States appointed delegates; all but Connecticut, Maryland, and the two Carolinas; but of the nine only Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York actually sent them. As the powers granted the commissioners presupposed a deputation from each of the States, those present, after mature deliberation, deemed it inadvisable to proceed, drawing up instead an urgent address to the States to take "speedy measures" for another, fuller, convention to meet on the second Monday of May, 1787, for the same purposes as had occasioned this one. Such was the mode in which the memorable Federal Convention came about.

The second Monday of May, 1787, which should have witnessed the opening, was the 14th, but on that day too few deputies had assembled. So late as the 25th only nine States were represented. They, however, effected an organization on the 25th and chose officers. On the 28th eleven States were present, so that on the next day business began in earnest. Governor Randolph read and expounded the Virginia plan for a new government, and Charles Pinckney the South Carolina plan. Both of these were referred to a committee of the whole to sit next day.

This Virginia plan was substantially the work of Madison, and was the earliest sketch of the present Constitution of the United States. With the Pinckney plan, it was worked over, debated, and amended in the committee of the whole, until June 13th, on which day the committee rose and reported to the Convention nineteen resolutions based almost wholly upon the Virginia plan. These were the text for all the subsequent doings of the Convention.

The so-called New Jersey plan was brought forward on June 15th, the gist of it being a recurrence to the foolish idea of merely repairing the Confederation that then was. Its strength, which was slight, consisted in its accord with the letter of the credentials which the delegates had brought. It was, however, emphatically rejected, the Convention stretching instructions, ignoring the old government, and proceeding to build from the foundations. On July 24th and 26th the resolutions, now increased to twenty-three, were put in the hands of a committee of detail to be reported back in the form of a constitution. They reappeared in this shape on August 6th, and this new document was henceforth the basis of discussion. On September 8th a new committee was appointed to revise style and arrangement, and brought in its work September 13th, after which additions and changes were few. The Constitution received signature September 17th.

The Federal Convention of 1787 was the most remarkable gathering in all our national history thus far. Sixty-five delegates were elected, but as

ten never attended, fifty-five properly made up the body. Even these were at no time all present together. From July 5th to August 13th New York was not represented. Rhode Island was not represented at all. Washington was President; Franklin, aged eighty-one, the oldest member; Gillman, of New Hampshire, aged twenty-five, the youngest. Each State sent its best available talent, so that the foremost figures then in American political life were present, the chief exceptions being John Adams, Jefferson—both abroad at the time—Samuel Adams, not favorable to the Convention, John Jay, and Patrick Henry. Eight of the members had signed the great Declaration, six the Articles of Confederation, seven the Annapolis appeal of 1786. Washington and a good half dozen others had been conspicuous military leaders in the Revolution. Five had been or still were governors of their respective States. Nearly all had held important offices of one sort or another. Forty of the fifty-five had been in Congress, a large proportion of them coming to the Convention directly from the congressional session just ended in New York.

It is interesting to note how high many from this Constituent Assembly rose after the adoption of the paper which they had indited. Washington and Madison became Presidents, Gerry Vice-President, Langdon senator and President of the Senate, with duty officially to notify him who was already First in War that the nation had made him also First in Peace. Langdon was candidate for Vice-President in 1809. Randolph was the



earliest United States Attorney-General, Hamilton earliest Secretary of the Treasury, M'Henry second Secretary of War, succeeding General Knox. Dayton was a representative from New Jersey in the IIId, IIIId, IVth, and Vth Congresses, being Speaker during the last, then senator in the VIth, VIIth, and VIIIth. Ellsworth and Johnson were Connecticut's first pair of senators, Johnson passing in 1791 to the presidency of Columbia College, Ellsworth to the national chief-justiceship to succeed Jay. Rutledge was one of the first associate justices of the Supreme Court. Subsequently, in July, 1795, Washington nominated him for chief justice, and he actually presided over the Supreme Court at its term in that year; but, for his ill-mannered denunciation of Jay's treaty, the Senate declined to confirm him. Wilson and Patterson also each held the position of associate justice on the supreme bench of the nation.

Rufus King, after the adoption of the constitution, removed to New York. He was a senator from that State between 1789 and 1795, and again between 1813 and 1826; and Minister to England from 1796 to 1803, and again after 1826 till his failing health compelled his resignation. He was the federalist candidate for vice-president in 1804 and 1808, and for President in 1816. Sherman of Connecticut, Gillman of New Hampshire, and Baldwin of Georgia, went into the House of Representatives and were promoted thence to the Senate. Robert Morris of Pennsylvania, Gouverneur Morris, now again of New York, Caleb Strong of

Massachusetts, Patterson of New Jersey, Dickinson and Bassett of Delaware, Alexander Martin and Blount of North Carolina, Charles Pinckney and Butler of South Carolina, and Colonel Few of Georgia, all became senators. Madison, Gerry, Fitzsimmons of Pennsylvania, Carroll of Maryland, and Spaight and Williamson of North Carolina, all wrought well in the House, but did not reach the Senate. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney was nominated for the presidency in 1800, on the ticket with John Adams, again in 1804 and still again in 1808.

Jared Ingersoll was the federalist candidate for Vice-president in 1812, on the ticket with DeWitt Clinton, against Madison and Gerry. Yates rose to be Chief Justice of the State of New York, Lansing to be its Chancellor. Gerry and Strong of Massachusetts, Patterson of New Jersey, Bassett of Delaware, Spaight and Davie of North Carolina, and Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, became Governors of their States, as did Alexander Martin, of North Carolina, a second time.

Having received final revision and signature, the Constitution was transmitted, with a commendatory letter from Washington, to the old Congress. Suggestions were added relating to the mode of launching it. Congress was requested to lay the new Great Charter before the States, and, so soon as it should have been ratified by nine of them, to fix the date for the election by these of presidential electors, the day for the latter to cast their votes, and the time and place for commencing proceedings under the revised constitution. Congress complied.

The debates of the Convention, only more hot, attended ratification, which was carried in several States only by narrow majorities.

Delaware was the first to ratify, December 7, 1787. Pennsylvania and New Jersey soon followed, the one on the 12th of the same month, the other on the 18th. Delaware and New Jersey voted unanimously; Pennsylvania ratified by a vote of forty-six to twenty-three. During the first month of the new year, 1788, Georgia and Connecticut ratified, on the 2d and 9th respectively. New Hampshire next took up the question, but adjourned her convention to await the action of Massachusetts. In this great State the people were divided almost equally. Of the western counties the entire population that had sympathized or sided with Shays was bitter against the Constitution. The larger centres and in general the eastern part of the State favored it. The vote was had on February 6th, and showed a majority of only nineteen out of 355 in favor of the Constitution.

The good work still remained but half done. It was a crisis. Accordingly, early in this year, Hamilton, Madison, and Jay published their weighty articles, since collected in the immortal volume known as "The Federalist." These discussions seemed to have much effect. Maryland ratified on April 28th, and South Carolina on May 23d. New Hampshire fell into line, the necessary ninth State to ratify, June 21st. Thus the Constitution became binding, yet it was still painfully uncertain what the action of Virginia and New York would be. In both States the Constitution was opposed

by many of the most influential men, and after a long and heated canvass adoption occurred in Virginia by a majority of only ten in a vote of 168; in New York by the narrow majority of two. Even now North Carolina and Rhode Island remained aloof. The former, not liking the prospect of isolation, came into the Union November 21, 1789, after the new government had been some time at work. Rhode Island, owing to her peculiar history in the matter of religious liberty, which she feared a closer union would jeopardize, as well as to the strength of the paper-money fanaticism within her borders, was more obdurate. The chief difficulty here was to get the legislature to call a convention. The New York *Packet* of February 20, 1790, in a letter from Rhode Island, tells how this was accomplished. Among the anti-adoptionists in the senate was a rural clergyman who, prompted by his conscience, or, as one account runs, by exhortation and the offer of a conveyance by an influential member of the adoption party, was, when Sunday came, absent upon his sacred work. The occasion was seized for a ballot. The senate was a tie, but the Governor threw the casting vote for a convention. This was called as soon as possible, and on May 29, 1790, Rhode Island, too, at the eleventh hour, made the National Constitution her own. Not only had a MORE PERFECT UNION been formed at last, but it included all the Old Thirteen States.

**PART SECOND**

**THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE  
CONSTITUTION**



## PERIOD I.

### *THE UNITED STATES AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION*

1789-1814

## CHAPTER I.

### THE NEW GOVERNMENT

NOTIFIED on July 2, 1788, that nine States had voted approval of the Constitution, Congress, on September 13th, set the first Wednesday in January, 1789, for the choice of electors, the first in February for their ballot, and the first in March for putting the new government in motion. The first Wednesday in March, 1789, happening to fall on the 4th, this date has since remained as the initial one for presidencies and congresses. The First Congress had no quorum in either branch on March 4th, and did not complete its organization till April 6th. Washington was inaugurated on April 30th, in New York, where the First Congress, proceeding to execute the Constitution, held its entire first session. Its second session was in Philadelphia, the seat of Congress thence till the second session of the VIth Congress, 1800, since which time Congress has always met in Washington.

The inauguration of our first President was an imposing event. As the hero moved from his house on Franklin Square, through Pearl Street to Broad, and through Broad to Federal Hall, corner of Wall Street, people thronged every sidewalk, door-way, window, and roof along the entire line of march. About him on the platform after his arrival stood John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Baron Steuben, Generals St. Clair and Knox, Roger Sherman, and Chancellor Livingston. Washington advanced to the rail, placed his hand upon his breast, and, bowing low, said audibly, as the Chancellor in his robes solemnly recited the words, "I swear, so help me God," reverently kissing the Bible as if to add solemnity to his oath. "It is done," cried the Chancellor; "long live George Washington, President of the United States!" The great crowd repeated the cry. It was echoed outside in the city, off into the country, far north, far south, till the entire land took up that watchword, which his own generation has passed on to ours and to all that shall come, Long live George Washington.

Let us study for a moment the habitat of the people over which the new Chief Magistrate was called to bear sway. By the census of 1790, the population of the thirteen States and of the territory belonging to the Union numbered 3,929,214. It resided almost wholly on the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida. Not more than five per cent. of it was west of the mountains. The line of inner settlement, now farther, now nearer, ran at an average distance from the coast of two hundred



and fifty-five miles. The coast land of Massachusetts, southern New England, and New York was the most densely covered. The Hudson Valley was well peopled as far as Albany. Farms and hamlets were to be met all the way from New York across New Jersey to the Delaware, and far up the Delaware Valley westward from that river. Maine, still belonging to Massachusetts, had few settlements except upon her coast and a little way inland along her great rivers. Vermont, not yet a State and claimed by both New Hampshire and New York, was well filled up, as was all New Hampshire but the extreme north.

The westward movement of population took mainly four routes, the Mohawk and Ontario, the Upper Potomac, the Southwestern Virginia, and the Western Georgia. The Mohawk Valley was settled, and pioneers had taken up much land on Lake Ontario and near the rivers and lakes tributary to it. Elmira and Binghamton had been begun. Pennsylvania settlers had prosseed westward more or less thickly to the lower elevations of the Alleghanies, while beyond, in the Pittsburgh regions, they were even more numerous. What is now West Virginia had squatters here and there. Virginian pioneers had also betaken themselves southwestward to the head of the Tennessee. North and South Carolina were inhabited as far west as the mountains, though the population was not dense. In Northern Kentucky, along the Ohio, lay considerable settlements, and in Tennessee, where Nashville now is, there was another centre of civilization. In the Northwest Territory, Detroit,

Vincennes, Kaskaskia, Prairie du Chien, Mackinac, and Green River were outposts, at each of which a few white men might have been found.

The following table shows pretty nearly the population of the several States about the end of the Revolution :

New Hampshire .....	102,000
Massachusetts .....	330,000
Rhode Island [1783] .....	51,869
[2,342 of them negroes, 464 mulattoes, 525 Indians.]	
Connecticut [1782].....	208,870
New York [1786].....	215,283
New Jersey [1785].....	138,934
[10,500 of them negroes.]	
Pennsylvania.....	330,000
Delaware.....	37,000
Maryland.....	250,000
[80,000 of them negroes.]	
Virginia.....	532,000
[280,000 of them negroes.]	
North Carolina .....	224,000
[60,000 of them negroes.]	
South Carolina .....	188,000
[80,000 of them negroes.]	
Georgia [rough estimate].....	80,000
[20,000 of them negroes.]	

Another table exhibits approximately the number of houses in the principal cities of the country in 1785-86. It was customary then in estimating population to allow seven persons to each house. This multiplier is probably too large rather than too small.

	Houses.	Population, multiplying number of houses by seven.
Portsmouth, N. H.....	450	3,150
Newburyport .....	510	3,570
Salem, Mass.....	730	5,210
Boston.....	2,200	15,400
Providence .....	560	3,920
Newport.....	790	5,530
Hartford .....	300	2,100
New Haven.....	400	2,800
New York.....	3,340	23,380
Albany and suburbs.....	550	3,850
Trenton.....	180	1,260
Philadelphia and suburbs.....	4,500	31,500
Wilmington.....	400	2,800
Baltimore .....	1,950	13,650
Annapolis .....	260	1,820
Frederick, Md.....	400	2,800
Alexandria .....	300	2,100
Richmond.....	310	2,170
Petersburg .....	280	1,960
Williamsburg.....	230	1,610
Charleston.....	1,540	10,780
Savannah.....	200	1,400

The first New York City Directory appeared in 1786. It had eight hundred and forty-six names, not going above Roosevelt and Cherry Streets on the East side, or Dey Street on the West. There were then in the city three Dutch Reformed churches, four Presbyterian, three Episcopal, two German Lutheran, and one congregation each belonging to the Catholics, Friends, Baptists, Moravians, and Jews. In 1789 the Methodists had two churches, and the Friends two new Meetings.

The houses in the city were generally of brick, with tile roofs, mostly English in style, but a few Dutch. The old Fort, where the provincial governors had resided, still stood in the Battery. The City Hall was a brick structure, three stories high, with wings, fronting on Broad Street. Want of good water greatly inconvenienced the citizens, as there was no aqueduct yet, and wells were few. Most houses supplied themselves by casks from a pump on what is now Pearl Street, this being replenished from a pond a mile north of the then city limits. New York commanded the trade of nearly all Connecticut, half New Jersey, and all Western Massachusetts, besides that of New York State itself. In short it did the importing for one-sixth of the population of the Union. Pennsylvania and Maryland made the best flour. In the manufacture of iron, paper, and cabinet ware, Pennsylvania led all the States.

Over this rapidly growing portion of the human race in its widely separated homes there was at last a central government worthy the name. The old Articles of Confederation had been no fundamental law, not a foundation but a homely botch-work of superstructure, resembling more a treaty between several States than a ground-law for one. In the new constitution a genuine foundation was laid, the Government now holding direct and immediate relations with each subject of every State, and citizens of States being at the same time citizens of the United States. Hitherto the central power could act on individuals only through States. Now, by its own marshals, aided if need were by its

army, it could itself arrest and by its own courts try and condemn any transgressor of its laws.

But if the State relinquished the technical sovereignty which it had before, it did not sink to the level of an administrative division, but increased rather in all the elements of real dignity and stability. Over certain subjects the new constitution gave the States supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable power. The range of this supreme state prerogative is, in fact, wider on the whole than that of national. For national action there must be demonstrable constitutional warrant, for that of States this is not necessary. In more technical phrase: to the United States what is not granted is denied, to the State what is not denied is granted. It is a perpetual reminder of original state sovereignty that no State can without its consent be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. Each State also must have at least one representative. States cannot be sued by private persons or corporations. Even upon subjects constitutionally reserved for national law, if Congress has not legislated state statute is valid.

Precisely as its advocates had prophesied, this revised order worked well, bringing a blessed new feeling of security. On commerce and business it conferred immense benefits, which rapidly became disseminated through all classes of the population. The sense and appearance of unity and consequent strength which the land had enjoyed in the early days of the Revolution came back in greater completeness, and was most gratifying to all. There was still a rankling hatred toward England,

and men hostile to central government on other grounds were reconciled to it as the sole condition of successful commercial or naval competition with that country.

The consequence was a wide-spread change of public feeling in reference to the Constitution very soon after its adoption. Bitterest hostility turned to praise that was often fulsome, reducing to insignificance an opposition that had probably comprised a popular majority during the very months of ratification. Many shifted their ground merely to be on the popular side. With multitudes Washington's influence had more weight than any argument.

The Constitution's unfortunate elasticity of interpretation also for the time worked well. People who had fought it saw how their cherished views could after all be based upon it. All parties soon began, therefore, to swear by the Constitution as their political Bible. The fathers of the immortal paper were exalted into demigods. Fidelity to the Constitution came to be pre-eminently the watchword of those till now against its adoption. They in fact shouted this cry louder than the Federalists, who had never regarded it a perfect instrument of government. It came to pass ere long that nothing would blast a public measure so instantly or so completely as the cry of its unconstitutionality.

Few can form any idea of the herculean work performed by the First Congress in setting up and starting our present governmental machinery. The debt which we owe the public men of that











time is measureless. With such care and wisdom did they proceed that little done by them has required alteration, the departments having run on decade after decade till now essentially in their original grooves. The Senate formed itself into its three classes, so that one-third of its members, and never more than this, should retire at a time. Four executive departments were created, those of State, the Treasury, War, and the Attorney-Generalship. The first occupants were, respectively, Jefferson, Hamilton, Knox, and Randolph.

Of the present departments of government the post-office alone has come down from colonial times, Benjamin Franklin having been general superintendent thereof under the British Government. He was re-appointed by the second Continental Congress, in July, 1775. The First Congress under the Constitution erected a general post-office, but its head attained the dignity of a regular cabinet officer not till about 1830, and then only by custom. To begin with, in fact, there was strictly no cabinet in the modern sense. Washington's habit was to consult his ministers separately.

Under the Articles of Confederation there had been a treasury board of several commissioners, and a superintendent of finance. The new arrangement, making one man responsible, was a great improvement. A law was passed forbidding the Secretary of the Treasury to be concerned in trade or commerce, that is, to be a merchant. The late A. T. Stewart, appointed by President Grant to the office, was rejected as ineligible under this

law. Yet no department of our Government has had a finer record than the Treasury.

Not only had the First Congress to vote revenue, but to make provision for the collection of this. Revenue districts had to be mapped out, the proper officers appointed, and light-houses, buoys, and public piers arranged for along the whole coast. Salaries were to be fixed, and a multitude of questions relating to the interpretation and application of the constitution to be solved by patient deliberation. The United States Mint was erected, and our so felicitous monetary system, based upon the decimal principle along with the binary, established in place of the desperate monetary chaos prevailing before. Hitherto there were four sorts of colonial money of account all differing from sterling, while Mexican dollars and numberless other forms of foreign money were in actual circulation.

The noblest part of all this work was the organization of the federal judiciary, through an act drawn up with extraordinary ability by Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut. A Chief Justice—the first one was John Jay—and five associates were to constitute the Supreme Court. District courts were ordained, one per State and one each for Kentucky and Maine, not yet States; also three circuit courts, the eastern, the middle, and the southern; and the jurisdiction of each grade was accurately fixed. As yet there were no special circuit judges, nor, excepting the temporary ones of 1801, were there till some eighty years later. Clerks, marshals, and district-attorneys were part of this first ar-

rangement. Originally the Attorney-General was little but an honorary officer. He kept his practice, had no public income but his fees, and resided where he pleased.

As his title implies, the Secretary of War was to have charge of all the nation's means of offence and defence, there being until April 30, 1796, no separate secretary for the navy. We had indeed in 1789 little use for such a functionary, not a war-vessel then remaining in Government's possession. In 1784 our formidable navy consisted of a single ship, the *Alliance*, but the following year Congress ordered her sold.

The senators most active in the creations just reviewed were Langdon, King, and Robert Morris, besides Ellsworth. In the House, Madison outdid all others in toil as in ability, though worthily seconded by distinguished men like Fisher Ames, Gerry, Clymer, Fitzsimmons, Boudinot, and Smith. The three Connecticut representatives, Sherman, Trumbull, and Wadsworth, made up perhaps the ablest state delegation in the body.

## CHAPTER II.

### FEDERALISM AND ANTI-FEDERALISM

EARLY in the life of our Constitution two parties rose, which, under various names, have continued ever since. During the strife for and against adoption, those favoring this had been styled Federalists, and their opponents, Anti-Federalists. After adoption—no one any longer really antagonizing the Constitution—the two words little by little shifted their meaning, a man being dubbed Federalist or Anti-Federalist according to his preference for strong national government or for strong state governments. The Federalist Party gave birth to the Whig Party, and this to the modern Republican Party. The Anti-Federalists came to be called “Republicans,” then “Democratic-Republicans,” then simply “Democrats.”

The central plank of the federalist platform was vigorous single nationality. In aid of this the Federalists wished a considerable army and navy, so that the United States might be capable of ample self-defence against all foes abroad or at home. Partly as a means to this, partly to build up national feeling, unity, self-respect, and due respect for the nation abroad, they sought to erect our national credit, which had fallen so low, and to plant

it on a solid and permanent basis. As still further advancing these ends they proposed so to enforce regard for the national authority and laws and obedience to them, that within its sphere the nation should be absolutely and beyond question paramount to the State.

In many who cherished them these noble purposes were accompanied by a certain aristocratic feeling and manner, a carelessness of popular opinion, an inclination to model governmental polity and administration after the English, and an impatience with what was good in our native American ideas and ways, which, however natural, were unfortunate and unreasonable. Puffed up with pride at its victory in carrying the constitution against the opposition of the ignorant masses, this party developed a haughtiness and a lack of republican spirit amounting in some cases to deficient patriotism.

The early Federalists were of two widely different stripes. There were among them convinced and thorough patriots, theoretical believers in a consolidated authority, like Washington, Adams, Hamilton, and Jay ; and there were the interested and practical advocates of the same, made up of business men and the wealthy and leisurely classes, who, without intending to be selfish, were governed in political sympathy and action mainly by their own interests.

The greatest early Anti-Federalists were Jefferson, Madison, and Randolph, all of whom had been ardent for the Constitution. The party as a whole, indeed, not only acquiesced in the re-creation of

the general Government but was devotedly friendly to the new order. But while Republicans admitted that a measure of governmental centralization was indispensable, they prized the individual State as still the main pillar of our political fabric, and were hence jealous of all increased function at the centre. It became more and more their theory that the States, rather than the individuals of the national body politic, had been the parties to the Constitution, so making this to be a compact like the old Articles, and the government under it a confederacy as before 1789.

Another issue divided the parties, that between the strict and the more free interpretation of the Constitution—between the close constructionists and the liberal constructionists. The question dividing them was this: In matters relating to the powers of the general Government, ought any unclear utterance of the Constitution to be so explained as to enlarge those powers, or so as to confine them to the narrowest possible sphere? Each of the two tendencies in construction has in turn brought violence to our fundamental law, but the sentiment of nationality and the logic of events have favored liberality rather than narrowness in interpreting the parchment. When in charge of the government, even strict constructionists have not been able to carry out their theory. Thus Jefferson, to purchase Louisiana, was obliged, from his point of view, to transcend constitutional warrant; and Madison, who at first opposed such an institution as unconstitutional, ended by approving the law which chartered the Second United States Bank.



The Federalists used to argue that Article 1, Section VIII., the part of the Constitution upon which debate chiefly raged, could not have been intended as an exhaustive statement of congressional powers. The Government would be unable to exist, they urged, to say nothing of defending itself and accomplishing its work, unless permitted to do more than the eighteen things there enumerated. They further insisted that plain utterances of the Constitution presuppose the exercise by Congress of powers not specifically enumerated, explicitly authorizing that body to make all laws necessary for executing the enumerated powers "and *all other powers* vested in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

In reply the Anti-Federalists made much of the titles "United States," "Federal," and the like, in universal use. They appealed to concessions as to the nature of our system made by statesmen of known national sympathies. Such concessions were plentiful then and much later. Even Webster in his immortal reply to Hayne calls ours a government of "strictly limited," even of "enumerated, specified, and particularized" powers. Two historical facts told powerfully for the anti-federalist theory. One was that the government previous to 1789 was unquestionably a league of States; the other was that many voted for the present Constitution supposing it to be a mere revision of the old. Had the reverse been commonly believed, adoption would have been more than doubtful.

## CHAPTER III.

### DOMESTIC QUESTIONS OF WASHINGTON'S ADMINISTRATIONS

I. *Tariff*.—Upon declaring their independence the United States threw open their ports, inviting trade from all nations. During the Revolution foreign commerce had become an important interest, and at its close the inclination of all, the more so from memory of England's accursed navigation acts, would have been to leave it untrammelled. Several motives, however, induced resort to a restrictive policy which, beginning with 1789, and for years expected to be temporary, has been pursued with little deviation ever since. Of course the Government needed revenue, and the readiest means of securing this was a tax on imports. Rates were made low, averaging until 1808 only  $11\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. As a consequence the revenues were large.

The movers of this first tariff, especially Hamilton, also wished by means of it to make the central Government felt as a positive power throughout the land. It had this effect. All custom-houses passed to the United States, and United States officers appeared at every port, having an authority, in its kind, paramount to that of state functionaries.

A stronger consideration still was to retaliate against England. In spite of America's political independence the old country was determined to retain for her merchant marine its former monopoly here. Orders in council practically limited all the commerce of England and her remaining colonies with this country to English ships, although, from the relations of the two lands and the nature of their productions, our chief foreign trade must still be with England. There was no way to meet this selfish policy but to show that it was a game which we too could play.

Besides, however we behaved toward the motherland, we needed to be prepared for war, because it was evident that George III. and his ministers had only too good a will to reduce us again to subjection if opportunity offered. Should we, by taxing imports, become independent in the production of war material, a fresh struggle for life would be much more hopeful than if we continued dependent upon foreign lands for military supplies.

II. *Funding the Debt.*—In the first years after they had set up their new constitution the people of this country staggered under a terrible financial load. Besides the current expenses of Government, there were: 1, the federal debt due abroad, over thirteen million dollars, including arrears; 2, the federal debt held at home, about forty-two and one-half million; 3, the state revolutionary debts, aggregating nearly twenty-five millions. Each of these sums was largely made up of unpaid interest.

The foreign debt Congress unanimously deter-

mined to pay in full. In respect to the domestic federal debt two opinions prevailed. Hamilton was for liquidating this also to the last copper. But these securities had mostly changed hands since issue, so that dollar for dollar payment would not advantage original holders but only speculators. As soon as Hamilton's recommendation became public this class of paper rose from about fifteen cents per dollar to fifty cents, and enterprising New York firms hurried their couriers, relay horses, and swift packets to remote parts of the Union to buy it up. Madison, supported by a strong party, proposed, therefore, to pay only original debtors at par, allowing secondary holders barely the highest market value previous to the opening of the question in Congress. He was overruled, however, and this part of the debt, too, was ordered paid according to its literal terms.

Even the motion that the United States should assume and discharge the state debts finally prevailed, though against most violent and resolute opposition. This came especially from Virginia, who had gone far in the payment of her own war debt, and thought it unjust to have to help the delinquent States. Her objection was strengthened by the fact that most of the debt was owned in the North. The victory was secured by what is now termed a "deal," northern votes being promised in favor of a southern location for the national capital, in return for enough southern votes to pass the bill assuming state debts.

These gigantic measures had origin in the mind of Hamilton. To many they appeared and appear

to-day like a grand government job. But they worked well, laying the foundation of our national credit. Interest arrears and back instalments of the foreign debt were to be paid at once with the proceeds of a fresh loan, supplemented by income from customs and tonnage. The remaining debt was to be refunded. Federal stocks shot up in value, moneyed interests became attached to the Government, and the nation began to be looked to as a more reliable bulwark of sound finance than any of the States.

III. *The Excise*.—Unexpectedly productive as the tariff had proved, public income still fell short of what these vast operations required. Direct taxation or a higher tariff being out of the question, Hamilton proposed, and Congress voted, an excise on spirits, from nine to twenty-five cents a gallon if from grain, from eleven to thirty if from imported material, as molasses. Excise was a hated form of tax, and this measure awakened great opposition in Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and New England, and most of all in Pennsylvania, in whose western counties distilling was the staple industry.

Here, far from the seats of power, even the state government had asserted itself little. The general Government was defied. A meeting in Washington County voted to regard as an enemy any person taking office under the excise law. September 6, 1791, a revenue officer was tarred and feathered. Other such cases followed. Secret societies were formed to oppose the law. Whippings and even murders resulted. At last there was a veritable reign of terror. The President proceeded slowly

but with firmness, accounting this a good opportunity vividly to reveal to the people the might of the new Government. Militia and volunteers were called out, who arrived in the rebellious districts in November, 1794. Happily, their presence sufficed. The opposition faded away before them, not a shot being fired on either side.

IV. *The Bank.*—The Secretary of the Treasury pleaded for a United States Bank as not only profitable to Government but indispensable to the proper administration of the national finances. Congress acquiesced, yet with so violent hostility on the part of many that before approving the Charter Act Washington required the written opinions of his official advisers. Jefferson powerfully opposed such an institution as unconstitutional, his acute argument being the arsenal whence close constructionists have gotten their weapons ever since. Randolph sided with Jefferson, Knox with Hamilton. The President at last signed, agreeing with Hamilton in the view that Congress, being the agent of a sovereignty, is not, within any sphere of action constitutionally open to it, shut up to specific or enumerated modes of attaining its ends, but has choice among all those that nations customarily use. The Supreme Court has proceeded on this doctrine ever since. The bank proved vastly advantageous. Three-fourths of every private subscription to its stock had to be in government paper, which raised this to par, while it naturally became the interest of all stockholders to maintain and increase the stability and credit of the Government.

## CHAPTER IV.

### RELATIONS WITH ENGLAND

IN 1789 France adopted a constitution. Provoked at this, the friends of absolute monarchy withdrew from France, and incited the other powers of Europe to interpose in effort to restore to Louis XVI. his lost power. The result was that Louis lost his head as well as his power, and that France became a republic. War with all Europe followed, which elevated that matchless military genius, Napoleon Bonaparte, first to the head of France's armies, then to her throne, to be toppled thence in 1814, partly by his own indiscretions, partly by the forces combined against him.

From the beginning to the end of this revolutionary period abroad, European politics determined American politics, home as well as foreign, causing dangerous embarrassment and complications. War having in February, 1793, been declared by England and France against each other, what attitude the United States should assume toward each became a pressing question. Washington's proclamation of neutrality, April 22, 1793, in effect, though not so meant, annulled our treaty of 1778 with France, which bound us to certain armed services to that monarchy in case of a rupt-

ure between her and England. Washington's paper alleged that "the duty and interests of the United States" required impartiality, and assumed "to declare the disposition of the United States to observe" this.

"The proclamation," wrote Jefferson, "was in truth a most unfortunate error. It wounds the popular feelings by a seeming indifference to the cause of liberty. And it seems to violate the form and spirit of the Constitution by making the executive magistrate the organ of the 'disposition' 'the duty' and 'the interest' of the nation in relation to war and peace—subjects appropriated to other departments of the Government."

"On one side," says Mr. Rives, in his "Life of Madison," "the people saw a power which had but lately carried war and desolation, fire and sword, through their own country, and, since the peace, had not ceased to act toward them in the old spirit of unkindness, jealousy, arrogance, and injustice; on the other an ally who had rendered them the most generous assistance in war, had evinced the most cordial dispositions for a liberal and mutually beneficial intercourse in peace, and was now set upon by an unholy league of the monarchical powers of Europe, to overwhelm and destroy her, for her desire to establish institutions congenial to those of America."

The more sagacious opponents of the administration believed true policy as well as true honesty to demand rigid and pronounced adherence to the letter of the French treaty. They were convinced from the outset that France would vanquish her



enemies, and that close alliance with her was the sure and the only sure way to coerce either Great Britain to justice or Spain to a reasonable attitude touching the navigation of the Mississippi ; while by offending France, they argued, we should be forced to wrestle single-handed with England first, then with victorious France, meantime securing no concession whatever from Spain.

This was a shrewd forecast of the actual event. The Federalists, destitute of idealism, proved to have been overawed by the prestige of England and to have under-estimated the might which freedom would impart to the French people. After Napoleon's great campaign of 1796-97, Pitt seeks peace, which the French Directory feels able to decline. In 1802 the Peace of Amiens is actually concluded, upon terms dictated by France. Had we been still in France's friendship, the two republics might have compelled England's abandonment of that course which evoked the war of 1812. As it was, ignored by England, to whom, as detailed below, we cringed in consenting to Jay's treaty, we were left to encounter the French navy alone, escaping open and serious war with France only by a readiness to negotiate which all but compromised our dignity. The Mississippi we had at last to open with money.

The federalist leaning toward Great Britain probably did not to so great an extent as was then alleged and widely believed, spring from monarchical feeling. It was due rather to old memories, as pleasant as they were tenacious, that would not be dissociated from England ; to the individual-

istic tendencies of republicanism, alarming to many; and to conservative habits of political thinking, the dread of innovation and of theory. The returned Tories had indeed all become Federalists, which fact, with many others, lent to this attitude the appearance of deficient patriotism, of sycophancy toward our old foe and persecutor.

Great Britain had refused to surrender the western posts according to the peace treaty of 1783, unjustly pleading in excuse the treatment of loyalists by our States. Not only the presence but the active influence of the garrisons at these posts encouraged Indian hostilities. England had also seized French goods in American (neutral) vessels, though in passage to the United States, and treated as belligerent all American ships plying between France and her West Indian colonies, on the ground that this commerce had been opened to them only by the pressure of war. The English naval officers were instructed to regard bread-stuffs as contraband if bound for France, even though owned by neutrals and in neutral ships; such cargoes, however, to be paid for by England, or released on bonds being given to land them elsewhere than in France. In this practice England followed France's example, except that she actually paid for the cargoes, while France only promised.

Worst of all, Britain claimed and acted upon the right to press into her naval service British-born seamen found anywhere outside the territory of a foreign State, halting our ships on the high seas for this purpose, often leaving them half-manned, and sometimes recklessly and cruelly impressing

native-born Americans — an outrageous policy which ended in the war of 1812. The ignorance and injustice of the English admiralty courts aggravated most of these abuses.

Genet's proceedings, spoken of in the next chapter, which partly public sentiment, partly lack of army and navy made it impossible for our Government to prevent, enraged Great Britain to the verge of war. After the British orders in council of November 6, 1793, intended to destroy all neutral commerce with the French colonies, and Congress's counter-stroke of an embargo the following March, war was positively imminent. The President resolved to send Jay to England as envoy extraordinary, to make one more effort for an understanding.

The treaty negotiated by this gentleman, and ratified June 24, 1795 (excepting Article XII., on the French West India trade), was doubtless the most favorable that could have been secured under the circumstances; yet it satisfied no one and was humiliating in the extreme. The western posts were indeed to be vacated by June 1, 1796, though without indemnity for the past, but a British right of search and impressment was implicitly recognized, the French West Indian trade not rendered secure, and arbitrary liberty accorded to Great Britain in defining contraband. Opposition to ratification was bitter and nearly universal. The friends of France were jubilant. Jay was burned in effigy, Washington himself attacked. The utmost that Hamilton in his powerful "Letters of Camillus" could show was that the treaty seemed

preferable to war. Plainly we had then little to hope and much to fear from war with Great Britain, yet even vast numbers of Federalists denounced the pact as a base surrender to the nation's ancient tyrant, and wished an appeal to arms.

Fisher Ames's eloquence decided the House for the treaty. An invalid, with but a span of life before him, he spoke as from the tomb. "There is, I believe," so ran his peroration, "no member who will not think his chance to be a witness of the consequences (should the treaty fail of ratification) greater than mine. If, however, the vote should pass to reject, and a spirit should rise, as it will, with the public disorders, to make confusion worse confounded, even I, slender and almost broken as my hold on life is, may outlive the Government and Constitution of my country!"

It was the most delicate crisis of Washington's presidency, and no other American then alive, being in his place, could have passed through it successfully. After the fury gradually subsided, men for a long time acquiesced rather than believed in the step which had been taken. In the end the treaty proved solidly advantageous, rather through circumstances, however, than by its intrinsic excellence.

## CHAPTER V.

### RELATIONS WITH THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

At its beginning all Americans hailed the Revolution in France with joy, but its terrible excesses, when they appeared, produced here the same effect as in England, of alienating every one conservatively inclined. This included the mass of the federalist party. On the contrary, most of the Republicans, now more numerous, now less, actuated partly by true insight into the struggle, and partly by the magic of the words "revolution" and "republic," favored the revolutionists with a devotion which even the Reign of Terror in France scarcely shook. It was in consequence of this attitude on its part that the party came to be dubbed "democratic-republican" instead of "republican," the compound title itself giving way after about 1810 to simple "democratic."

Hostility to England, the memory of France's aid to us in our hour of need, the doctrine of "the rights of man," then so much in vogue, the known sympathies of Jefferson and Madison, who were already popular, and, alas, a mean wish to hamper the administration, all helped to swell the ranks of those who swung their hats for France. A far deeper motive with the more thoughtful was the

belief that neutrality violated our treaty of 1778 with France, a conclusion at present beyond question. Politically our policy may have been wise, morally it was wrong.

The administration, at least its honored head, was doubtless innocent of any intentional injustice; and it could certainly urge a great deal in justification of its course. The form and the aims of the French Government had changed since the treaty originated, involving a state of things which that instrument had not contemplated. France herself defied international law and compact, revolutionizing and incorporating Holland and Geneva, and assaulting our commerce. And war with England then threatened our ruin. Yet the pleading of these considerations in that so trying hour, even had they been wholly pertinent, could not but seem to Frenchmen treason to the cause of liberty. As to many Federalists, trucklers to England, such a charge would have been true.

France was not slow to reciprocate in the matter of grievances. In fact, so early as May, 1793, before the proclamation of neutrality could have been heard of in that country, orders had been issued there, wholly repugnant to the treaty (which had ordained that neutral ships could carry what goods they pleased—free ships, free goods), to capture and condemn English merchandise on American vessels. Provisions owned by Americans and *en route* to England were also to be forfeited as contraband. Even the most reasonable French officials seemed bent on treating our country as a dependency of France.

We see this in the actions of Genet, the first envoy to America from the French constitutional monarchy, accredited hither by a ministry of high-minded Republicans while Louis XVI. still sat upon his throne. Genet arrived in Charleston in 1793, before our neutrality had been proclaimed. Immediately, before presenting his credentials to our Government, he set about fitting out privateers, manning them with Americans, and sending them to prey upon British ships, some of which they captured in American waters. All this was in utter derogation of the treaty, which only guaranteed shelter to *bona fide* French vessels. Under a law of the French National Convention, Genet assumed to erect the French consulates in this country into so many admiralty courts for the trial of British prizes. We could not have allowed this without decidedly violating international law at least in spirit. He also devised and partly arranged expeditions of Americans, to start, one from Georgia to invade Florida, another from Kentucky to capture New Orleans, both as means of weakening Spain, which up to this time and for several years later was France's foe.

But Genet's worst gall came out in his conduct toward Washington. Him he insulted, challenging his motives and his authority for his acts and threatening to appeal from him to the people. He tried to bully and browbeat the whole cabinet as if they had been so many boys. So ludicrous did he make himself by such useless bluster, that his friends, at first numerous and many of them influential, gave him the cold shoulder, and the ardor

for France greatly cooled. At length Washington effected his removal, the more easily, it would seem, as he was not radical enough for the Jacobins, who had now succeeded to the helm in France. The officious Frenchman did not return to his own country, but settled down in New York, marrying a daughter of Governor Clinton. He was succeeded by Adet.

Upon learning that the United States had ratified Jay's treaty, France went insane with rage. A declaration of war by us could not have angered her more. Adet was called home and the alliance with America declared at an end. Barras dismissed Mr. Monroe, our minister, in a contemptuous speech, and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, sent as Monroe's successor, was not only not received but ordered from the land. New and worse decrees went forth against American commerce. Our ships were confiscated for carrying English goods though not contraband. Arbitrary and unheard-of tests of neutrality were trumped up, wholly contrary to the treaty, which indeed was now denounced. American sailors found serving, though compelled, on British armed vessels, were to be condemned as pirates.

These brutal measures, coupled with Napoleon's increasing power, begot in America the belief, even among Republicans, that France's struggle was no longer for liberty but for conquest. The insolence of the French Government waxed insufferable. President Adams, to a special session of the Vth Congress, on May 19, 1797, announced the insult to the nation in the person of Pinckney, and urged



preparation for war. A goodly loan, a direct tax, and a provisional army, Washington again leader, were readily voted. Our Navy Department was created at this time. The navy was increased, and several captures were made of French vessels guilty of outrage. Adams, however, to make a last overture for peace, despatched John Marshall and Elbridge Gerry to the aid of Pinckney, the three to knock once more at France's doors for a becoming admission. In vain. The only effect was a new chapter of French mendacity and insolence, furthering America's wish and preparations for war. Napoleon's recent Italian victories, terrifying Europe, had puffed up France with pride. Talleyrand assumed to arraign us as criminals, and what was worse, pressed us, through his agents, to buy his country's forgiveness with gold. "You must pay money," our envoys were told, and "a good deal of it, too."

All this was duly made known at Washington, and the President assured Congress that no terms were obtainable from France "compatible with the safety, honor, and general interest of the nation." The opposition thought this an exaggeration and called for the despatches, expecting refusal or abridgment. The President sent every word.

Confusion seized the Republicans. Federalists were again in the ascendant, the VIth Congress being much more strongly federalist than the Vth. For once proud, reserved John Adams was popular, and anti-French feeling irresistible. "Millions for defence but not a cent for tribute," echoed through the land. Hosts of Republicans went

over to the administration side. Patriotism became a passion. Each night at the theatre rose a universal call for the "President's March" \* and "Yankee Doodle," the audience rising, cheering, swinging hats and canes, and roaring "*encore*." The black cockade, American, on all hands supplanted the tricolor cockade worn by the "Gallosmaniacs;" and bands of "Associated Youth," organizing in every town and city, deluged the President with patriotic addresses.

Seeing that we could not be bullied and that the friends of France here were Americans first; ashamed, on their publication, of the indignities which he had offered our envoys, and after all not wishing war with what he saw to be potentially another naval power like England, the sly Talleyrand neatly receded from his arrogant demands, and expressed a desire to negotiate.

\* The music was that of our "Hail Columbia."

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE DECLINE OF THE FEDERALIST PARTY

THE heat of the nation's wrath evoked by this conflict with France betrayed the Federalists in Congress into some pieces of tyrannical legislation. These were especially directed against refugees from France, lest they should attempt to re-enact here the bloody drama just played out there. Combinations were alleged, without proof, to exist between American and French democrats, dangerous to the stability of this Government.

A new naturalization act was passed, requiring of an immigrant, as prerequisite to citizenship, fourteen years of residence instead of the five heretofore sufficient. Next came three alien acts, empowering the President, at his discretion, without trial or even a statement of his reasons, to banish foreigners from the land; any who should return unbidden being liable to imprisonment for three years, and cut off from the possibility of citizenship forever. A "sedition act" followed, to fine in the sum of \$5,000 each and to imprison for five years any persons stirring up sedition, combining to oppose governmental measures, resisting United States law, or putting forth "any false, scandalous, or malicious writings" against Congress, the President, or the Government.

To President Adams's credit, he was no abettor of these hateful decrees, and did little to enforce them. The sedition law, however, did not rest with him for execution, and was applied right and left. Evidently its champions were swayed largely by political motives. Matthew Lyon, a fiery Republican member of Congress from Vermont, had, in an address to his constituents, charged the President with avarice and with "thirst for ridiculous pomp and foolish adulation." He was convicted of sedition, fined \$1,000, and sentenced to four months in prison. This impoverished him, as well as took him from his place in Congress for most of a session. Adams refused pardon, but in 1840 Congress paid back the fine to Lyons's heirs.

It is now admitted that these measures were unconstitutional, as invading freedom of speech and of the press, and assigning to the Federal Judiciary a common-law jurisdiction in criminal matters. But they were also highly unwise, subjecting the Federalist Party to the odium of fearing free speech, of declining a discussion of its policy, and of hating foreigners. The least opposition to the party in power, or criticism of its official chiefs, became criminal, under the head of "opposing" the Government. A joke or a caricature might send its author to jail as "seditious." It was surely a travesty upon liberty when a man could be arrested for expressing the wish, as a salute was fired, that the wadding might hit John Adams behind. Even libels upon government, if it is to be genuinely free, must be ignored—a principle now acted upon by all constitutional States.

But the Federalists were blind to considerations like these. As Schouler well remarks: "A sort of photophobia afflicted statesmen, who, allowing little for the good sense and spirit of Americans, or our geographical disconnection with France, were crazed with the fear that this Union might be, like Venice, made over to some European potentate, or chained in the same galley with Switzerland or Holland, to do the Directory's bidding. That, besides this unfounded fear, operated the desire of ultra-Federalists to take revenge upon those presses which had assailed the British treaty and other pet measures, and abused Federal leaders, and the determination to eutrench themselves in authority by forcibly disbanding an opposition party which attracted a readier support at the polls from the oppressed of other countries, no candid writer can at this day question."

It was next the turn of the Republicans to blunder. In November, 1798, the Kentucky Legislature passed a series of resolutions, drawn up by John Breckenridge upon a sketch by Jefferson, in effect declaring the alien and sedition acts not law, but altogether void and of no force. In December the Virginia Legislature put forth a similar series by Madison, milder in tone and more cautiously expressed, denouncing those acts as "palpable and alarming infractions of the constitution." A year after their first utterance, the Kentucky law-makers further "resolved that the several States who formed (the constitution), being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction; and that

a nullification by those sovereignties, of all unauthorized acts done under color of that instrument, is the rightful remedy." Virginia again declared it a State's right "to interpose" in such cases.

These resolutions were intended to stir reflection and influence opinion, and, if possible, elicit a concurrent request to Congress from the various States to repeal the obnoxious acts. They do not hint at the use of force. Their execration of the hated laws is none too strong, and their argument as a whole is masterly and unanswerable. But at least those of Kentucky suggest, if they do not contain, a doctrine respecting the constitution which is untenable and baneful, in kernel the same that threatened secession in Jackson's time and brought it in Buchanan's. The State, as such, is not a party to the Constitution. Still less is the Legislature. Nor is either, but the Supreme Court, the judge whether in any case the fundamental law has been infringed.

Procuring the resolutions, however, proved a crafty political move. The enormity of the despicable acts was advertised as never before, while the endorsement of them by federalist legislators went upon record. Petitions for repeal came in so numerous and numerously signed that the VIth Congress could not but raise a committee to consider such action. It reported adversely, and the report was accepted, the majority in the House, fifty-two to forty-eight, trying contemptuously to cough down every speaker lifting his voice on the opposite side.

This sullen obstinacy in favor of a miserable

experiment sealed the doom of Federalism. In vain did the party orators plead that liberty of speech and the press is not license, but only the right to utter "the truth," that hence this liberty was not abridged by the acts in question, and that aliens had no constitutional rights, but enjoyed the privileges of the land only by favor. The fact remained, more and more appreciated by ordinary people, that a land ruled by such maxims could never be free.

So a deep distrust of Federalism sprung up, as out of sympathy with popular government. It was furthered by the attachment of prominent Federalists to England. Several of them are on record as ready to involve the United States in an expedition planned by one Miranda, to conquer Spanish America in aid of Great Britain, Spain and ourselves being perfectly at peace. The federalist chieftains were too proud, ignoring too much the common voter. They often expressed doubt, too, as to the permanence of popular institutions. Federalism had too close affinity with Puritanism to suit many outside New England. And then—deadly to the party even had nothing else concurred—there was a quarrel among its leaders. Hamilton, the Essex Junto (Pickering, Cabot, Quincy, Otis), and their supporters were set against Adams and his friends. This rivalry of long standing was brought to a head by Adams's noble and self-sacrificing independence in accepting France's overtures for peace, when Hamilton, Pickering, King, and all the rest, out of private or party interest rather than patriotism, wished war.

Toward 1800, Democracy bade fair soon to come into power, but the Federalists learned no wisdom. Rather were they henceforth more factious than ever, opposing Jefferson and Madison even when they acted on purely federalist principles. Tooth and nail they fought against the acquisition of Louisiana, the War of 1812, and the protective tariff of 1816, which was carried by Republicans. A worse spirit still was shown in their disunion scheme of 1804, after the purchase of Louisiana, and in the Hartford Convention of 1814. Federalism had further lost ground by its mean and revolutionary devices on resigning power in 1801, first to make Burr President instead of Jefferson, and, failing in this, to use its expiring authority in creating needless offices for its clients.

In consequence of such ill-advised steps, federalist strength waned apace. In 1804 Connecticut, Delaware, and Maryland alone chose federalist electors, the last only two such. In 1808 these were joined by the remaining New England States, North Carolina also casting three federalist votes. In 1812, indeed, Clinton received eighty-nine votes to Madison's one hundred and twenty-eight; but in 1816 again only Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Delaware were federalist. In 1820 not a State had a federalist majority. State elections in Maryland, North Carolina, Delaware, and Connecticut commonly went federalist till 1820, and in Massachusetts till 1823, when the Republicans swept this commonwealth too, Essex County and all.

Yet Federalism did not die without fixing its stamp indelibly upon our institutions. Not to men-



tion the Whig and the modern Republican Parties, close reproductions of it, or the public credit, its child, methods of administration passed with little change from Adams to Jefferson and his successors, and federalist principles modified the entire temper, and directed in no small degree the action of the Democratic Party while in power. The nation was exalted more, state rights subordinated, and the Constitution construed ever more broadly. Thus there was silently and gradually imparted to our governmental fabric a consistency and a solidity which were of incalculable worth against storms to come.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE WEST

A SIMPLE resolution of the Continental Congress in 1780 has proved of the highest consequence for the subsequent development of our country. It declared that all territorial land should be national domain, to be disposed of for the common benefit of the States, with the high privilege of itself growing into States coequal with the old Thirteen. The treaty of 1783 carried this domain north to the Lakes, west to the Mississippi. The Ohio divided it into a northwestern and a southwestern part. The land to the west of themselves Virginia and North Carolina claimed, and it became Kentucky and Tennessee, respectively, erected into statehood, the one June 1, 1792, the other June 1, 1796, these being the fifteenth and sixteenth States in order. Vermont, admitted in 1791, was the fourteenth. Virginia never released Kentucky till it became a State. The Tennessee country, ceded to the United States by North Carolina in 1784, the cession revoked and afterward repeated, had already, under the name of Frankland, enjoyed for some time a separate administration. The nucleus of Kentucky civilization was on the northern or Ohio River border, that of Tennessee in the Cum-

berland Valley about Nashville ; but by 1800 the borders of these two oases had joined.

United States land has since broadened westward to the Pacific, over the infinite areas which in 1800 belonged to Spain. From an early period there have been, as now, unorganized territory and also partially organized and fully organized territories, the last being inchoate States, ready to be admitted to full membership in the Union when sufficiently populous, on condition of framing each for itself a republican constitution.

The great ordinance of 1787, re-enacted by the First Congress, forever sealing the same to civil and religious liberty, opened the Northwest for immediate colonization, twenty thousand people settling there in the next two years. The territory was organized and General St. Clair made Governor. In 1788 Marietta was founded, named from Marie Antoinette, also Columbia near the mouth of the Little Miami. In the same year Losantiville, subsequently called Fort Washington, and now Cincinnati, was laid out, the first houses having gone up in 1780. Louisville, settled so early as 1773, contained in 1784 over one hundred houses. Emigrants in hundreds and thousands yearly poured over the mountains and down the Ohio. By the census of 1790 there were 4,280 whites northwest of this river, 1,000 at Vincennes, 1,000 on the lands of the Ohio Company, 1,300 on Symmes's purchase between the Great and the Little Miami, Cincinnati being part of this purchase. In 1800 these numbers had much increased. The settlements which had Pittsburgh for a nucleus had also

greatly extended, reaching the Ohio. Northern and Central Pennsylvania west of the Susquehanna Valley was yet a wilderness. St. Louis, in Spanish hands, but to become French next year, had been founded, and opposite it were the beginnings of what is now Alton, Ill.

The centre of United States population in 1790 was twenty-three miles east of Baltimore. It has since moved westward, not far from the thirty-ninth parallel, never more than sixteen miles north of it, or three to the south. In 1800 it was eighteen miles west of Baltimore; in 1810 it was forty-three miles northwest by west of Washington; in 1820 sixteen miles north of Woodstock, Va.; in 1830, nineteen miles west-southwest of Moorfield, W. Va.; in 1840, sixteen miles south of Clarksburg, same State; in 1850, twenty-three miles southeast of Parkersburg, same State; in 1860, twenty miles south of Chillicothe, O.; in 1870, forty-eight miles east by north of Cincinnati; in 1880, eight miles west by south of that city; in 1890, twenty miles east of Columbus, Ind., west by south of Greensburg. It has never since been so far north as in 1790, and it has described a total westward movement of four hundred and fifty-seven miles.

The land system of the United States was at first a bad one, intended to secure immediate revenue from the sale of immense pieces at auction, on long credit, at very few points, the land to find its way into the hands of actual settlers only through mercenary speculators. The honest pioneer was therefore at the mercy of these

land-sharks, greedy and unpatriotic in the extreme.

The western movement aroused the Indians, of whom there were, in 1790, from 20,000 to 40,000 north of the Ohio. The idea of amalgamating or even civilizing these people had long been practically given up. Settlers agreed in denouncing them as treacherous, intractable, bloodthirsty, and faithless. So incessant and terrific were their onslaughts, the Ohio Valley had come to be known as "the dark and bloody ground." The British, still occupying the western posts, used their influence to keep up and intensify Indian hostility to the United States settlers and Government.

In September, 1790, Governor St. Clair sent Harmar against the Indians on the Miami and Maumee. He had about fifteen hundred men, two-thirds of them militia. The expedition was ill-managed from the first, and, after advancing as far as the present Fort Wayne, came back with great loss to itself, having exasperated rather than injured the red men. Harmar, chagrined, soon resigned.

The Indians south of the Ohio were perhaps twice as numerous as those north, and partly civilized. The Chickasaws and Choctaws, nearest the Mississippi, gave little trouble. Not so the Cherokees and Creeks, whose seats were nearer the whites. The Creeks claimed parts of Tennessee, Georgia, and the Carolinas, justified herein by acts of the Continental Congress. However, the whites invaded this territory, provoking a fierce war, wherein the Cherokees allied themselves with the Creeks of Alabama and Georgia. This brave tribe had

border troubles of its own with Georgia. These various hordes of savages, having the Florida Spaniards to back them with counsel, arms, and ammunition, were a formidable foe, which might have annihilated Georgia but for aid from the general Government. McGillivray, the half-breed chief of the Creeks, was enticed to New York, where the kindness of Washington and the evident desire of Congress to deal with his people fairly, resulted in a treaty, August 13, 1790, which secured peace to the Southwest for a long time.

Touching the northwestern redskins, Harmer's defeat had convinced Washington that mild measures were not yet the thing. A larger force was fitted out against them under St. Clair in person, whom, as an old revolutionary comrade, Washington still trusted. General Butler was second in command. The two thousand regulars and one thousand militia rendezvoused at Cincinnati in the autumn of 1791. Part object of the expedition was to build a military road, with forts at intervals, all the way to the upper Wabash. Progress was therefore slow.

A fort was constructed on the present site of Hamilton, O.; then one to the northwest, near Greenville, O., close to the present Indiana line. From here the army pressed northwesterly still farther.

St. Clair was heroic, but incompetent through age and the gout. Some of his militia deserted. Chills and fever shook the remainder of his too slender host. His orders were not well obeyed. On

November 9th, encamping by a small branch of the Wabash, St. Clair's force was most vehemently attacked by Indians, under the redoubtable Joseph Brant or Thayendanegea—famed for his bloody exploits against us during the Revolution—and well-nigh annihilated. Five high officers, including Butler, were killed, and as many more sank from wounds. Cannons, guns, accoutrements, in fact the whole equipment of the army, were lost. After a four hours' fight St. Clair, sick but brave as a tiger, horse after horse shot beneath him, part of the time carried in a litter, his gray locks streaming in the breeze, put himself at the head of the five hundred who remained unscathed, and hewed his way through walls of savages to the rear. Six o'clock that night found the survivors back at Greenville, twenty-nine miles from the scene of carnage. Had the Indians pursued instead of stopping to mutilate the slain, every soul must have perished.

The announcement of this disaster called forth in the East a universal howl of rage at the unfortunate commander. Even Washington went beside himself: "To suffer that army to be cut to pieces, hacked, butchered, tomahawked, by a surprise—the very thing I guarded him against! O God! O God, he is worse than a murderer! How can he answer it to his country? The blood of the slain is upon him, the curse of widows and orphans, the curse of Heaven." St. Clair came East to explain. Hobbling into Washington's presence, he grasped his hand in both his own and sobbed aloud. He was continued as gov-

ernor, but had to resign his major-generalship, which passed to Anthony Wayne.

Wayne was every inch a warrior. Cautiously advancing over the road St. Clair's fugitives had reddened with their blood, he reached Fort Jefferson, at Greenville, in June, 1793. Next year he advanced to the junction of the Au Glaize with the Maumee. The Indians fleeing, he pursued to the foot of the Maumee Rapids, where he encountered them encamped by a fort which the English, defying the treaty, still held, fifty miles inside our lines. Wayne, agreeably to Washington's policy, tried to treat. Failing, he attacked, routed the enemy, and mercilessly ravaged the country, burning crops and villages. Building Fort Wayne as an advanced post, he came back and made his headquarters at Fort Jefferson. The Indians' spirit and opposition were at last broken. Their delegates flocked to Wayne, suing for peace. Captives were surrendered. The whole Ohio Territory now lay open to peaceful occupation, and emigrants crowded northward from the Ohio in great companies.

The pioneer bought land wherever he found a vacant spot that pleased him, building his hut, breaking up any open land for crops, and as rapidly as possible clearing for more. His white neighbors, if any were near, lent their assistance in this work. His rough dwelling of logs, with one room, floored with puncheon, caulked with mud, and covered with bark or thatch, however uncomfortable from our point of view, made him a habitable home. When this primitive mansion



was no longer sufficient, he was usually able to rear another out of hewn logs, with glass windows and a chimney. Then he felt himself an aristocrat, and who will deny that he was so? A large family grew up around him, neighbors moved in, the forest disappeared, the savages and wild beasts that at first harassed him slunk away, while the fruitful soil, with such exchanges and mail privileges as were speedily possible, yielded him all the necessaries and many of the comforts of life.

So rapid was the increase of population henceforth, that Congress, in 1800, divided the territory, the line running north from the junction of the Kentucky with the Ohio. All west of this was to be known as the Indiana Territory, William Henry Harrison its governor, and a territorial legislature to follow so soon as a majority of the inhabitants should desire. On February 19, 1803, Ohio became a State. Mainly through Governor Harrison's exertions a better system of marketing public land was begun, in healthy contrast with the old. It allowed four land-offices in Ohio and Indiana. Lands once offered at auction and not sold could be pre-empted directly by private individuals on easy terms. Actual settlement and cultivation were thus furthered, speculation curbed, and the government revenues vastly increased.

We have spoken mostly of the Northwest. The present States of Alabama and Mississippi north of 31°, except a narrow strip at the extreme north owned by South Carolina, were claimed by Georgia, but the part of this territory south of 32° 30'

the United States also claimed as having before the Revolution been separated from Georgia by the king and joined to West Florida, so that it, like the Northwest, passed to the United States at the treaty of 1783. This section was organized in 1798 as the Mississippi Territory. In 1802 Georgia relinquished all claim to the northern part as well, which Congress added to the Mississippi Territory. At this date there were settlements along the Mississippi bluffs below the Yazoo bottom.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### SOCIAL CULTURE AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

IN 1800 the population of our land was 5,305, 482, of whom 896,849 were slaves. New York City had 60,489; Philadelphia, 40,000; Boston, 24,937; Baltimore, 23,971; Charleston, 18,712; Providence, 7,614; Washington, 3,210. The population of Vermont, Northern and Western New York, and the Susquehanna Valley of Pennsylvania had grown considerably more dense since 1790. The social life, ideas, and habits of the rural districts had not altered much from those prevalent in colonial days, but in the more favored centres great improvements, or, at any rate, changes, might have been marked.

Even far in the country framed buildings were now the most common, the raising of one being a great event. The village school gave a half holiday. Every able-bodied man and boy from the whole country-side received an invitation — all being needed to “heave up,” at the boss carpenter’s pompous word of command, the ponderous timbers seemingly meant to last forever. A feast followed, with contests of strength and agility worthy of description on Homer’s page.

Skating was not yet a frequent pastime, nor

dancing, save in cities and large towns. Balls every pious New Englander abhorred as sinful. The theatre was similarly tabooed—in Massachusetts, so late as 1784, by law. New York and Philadelphia frowned upon it then, though jolly Baltimore already gave it patrons enough. When, in 1793, yellow fever desolated Philadelphia, one theory ascribed the affliction to the admission of the theatre. In other cities passion for the theatre was growing, and even Massachusetts tolerated it by an act passed in 1793. President Washington, while in New York, oftener than many thought proper, attended the old, sorrily furnished play-house in John Street, the only one which the city could then boast. John Adams also went now and again. Both were squinted at through opera-glasses, which were just coming into use and thought by the crowd to be infinitely ridiculous. Good hours were kept, as the play began at five.

All sorts of shows, games, and sports which the country could afford or devise were immensely popular, the most so, and the roughest, in the South. Horse-racing, cock-fighting, shooting matches, at all which betting was high, were there fashionable, as well as most brutal man-fights, in which ears were bitten off and eyes gouged out. President Thomas Jefferson was exceedingly fond of menageries and circuses, his diary abounding in such entries as : “pd for seeing a lion 21 months old 11½ d. ;” “pd seeing a small seal .125 ;” “pd seeing elephant .5 ;” “pd seeing elk .75 ;” “pd seeing Caleb Phillips a dwarf .25 ;” “pd seeing a painting .25.”

Lotteries were universal, and put to uses which now seem excessively queer. Whenever a bridge or a public edifice, as a school-house, was to be built, a street paved or a road repaired, the money was furnished through a lottery. In the same way manufacturing companies were started, churches aided, college treasuries replenished. It was with money collected through a lottery that Massachusetts first encouraged cotton spinning; that the City Hall of New York was enlarged, the Court House at Elizabeth rebuilt, the Harvard University library increased, and many pretentious buildings put up at the Federal City.<sup>1</sup> This was but a single form of the sporting mania. The public stocks, as well as the paper of the numerous canals, turn-pikes, and manufacturing corporations now springing up, were gambled in in a way which would almost shock Wall Street to-day.

Anthracite coal had been discovered and was just beginning to be mined, but on account of the plentifulness of wood was not for a long time largely used. The first idea of steam navigation was embodied in an English patent taken out by Jonathan Hulls in 1736. The initial experiment of the kind in this country was by William Henry, on the Conestoga River, Pennsylvania, in 1763. John Fitch navigated the Delaware steam-wise in 1783-84. In 1790 one of Fitch's steam paddle-boats made regular trips between Philadelphia and Trenton for four months. In 1785-86 Oliver Evans experimented in this direction, as did Rumsey, in Virginia, in 1787. One Morey ran a stern-wheeler of

<sup>1</sup> 1 McMaster's *United States*, 588.

his own make from Hartford to New York in 1794. Chancellor Livingston built a steamer on the Hudson in 1797. It was only in 1807 that Fulton finished his "Clermont" and made a passage up the Hudson to Albany from New York. It took thirty-three hours, and was the earliest thoroughly successful steam navigation on record. He subsequently built the "Orleans" at Pittsburgh. It was completed and made the voyage to New Orleans in 1811. No steamboat ruffled the waters of Lake Ontario till 1816. The pioneer steam craft on Lake Erie was launched at Black Rock, May 28, 1818. It is recorded as wonderful that in less than two hours it had gotten fifteen miles from shore.

At the North the muster or general training was, for secular entertainment, the day of days, when the local regiment came out to reveal and to perfect its skill in the manual and in the evolutions of the line. Side-shows and a general good time constituted for the crowds its chief interest. Cider, cakes, pop-corn, and candy drained boys' pockets of pennies, those who could afford the fun going in to see the one-legged revolutionary soldier with his dancing bear, the tattooed man, the ventriloquist, or the then "greatest show on earth." College commencements, too, at that time usually had all these festive accompaniments, and many a boy debated whether to spend his scant change here or at the muster. In New England, Christmas was not observed; it was hardly known, in fact, Thanksgiving taking its place, proclaimed with the utmost formality by the Governor some weeks in advance.

Intemperance was still terribly common ; worst in the newer sections of the country. There is extant a message of William Henry Harrison, while Governor of Indiana Territory, to his legislature, against this evil, urging better surveillance of public-houses. "The progress of intemperance among us," it runs, "outstrips all calculation, and the consequences of its becoming general I shudder to unfold. Poverty and domestic embarrassment and distress are the present effects, and prostration of morals and change of government must inevitably follow. The virtue of the citizens is the only support of a Republican Government. Destroy this and the country will become a prey to the first daring and ambitious chief which it shall produce."

To counteract this and other vices, which were justly viewed as largely the results of ignorance, philanthropic people were at this period establishing Sunday-schools, following the example of Robert Raikes, who began the movement at Gloucester, England, in 1781. They had been already introduced in New England, but were now making their way in Philadelphia and elsewhere. The first Methodist bishop, Asbury, zealously furthered them. They had, to begin with, no distinctive religious character, and churches even looked upon them with disfavor ; but their numbers increased and their value became more apparent until the institution was adopted by all denominations.

Before 1800 the new United States coinage, with nearly the same pieces as now, had begun to circulate, but had had little success at that date in

driving out the old foreign coins of colonial times. Especially were there still seen Spanish dollars, halves, quarters, fifths or pistareens, and eighths—the last being the Spanish “real,” “ryall,” or “royall,” worth twelve and a half cents—and tenths or half-pistareens, worth six and one-quarter cents each. Many of these pieces were sadly worn, passing at their face value only when the legend could be made out. Sometimes they were heated to aid in this. Many were so worn that a pistareen would bring only a Yankee shilling, sixteen and two-thirds cents; the half-pistareen only eight cents; the real, ten; the half-real, five.

The denominations of the colonial money of account were also still in daily use, and, indeed, might be heard so late as the Civil War. The “real,” twelve and one-half cents, was in New York a shilling, being one-twentieth of the pound once prevalent in the New York colony. In New England it was a “nine-pence,” constituting nearly nine-twelfths, or nine of the twelve pence of an old New England shilling of sixteen and two-thirds cents. Twenty such shillings had been required for the New England pound, which was so much more valuable than the pound of the New York colony. But neither one or any colonial pound was the equivalent of the pound sterling.

In the middle colonies, including Pennsylvania, the pound had possessed still a different value, the Spanish dollar, in which the Continental Congress kept its accounts, there equalling ninety pence. This is why those accounts stand in dollars and ninetieths, a notation so puzzling to many. A



“real” would here be about one-eleventh of ninety pence, hence called the “eleven-penny-piece,” shortened into “levy.” Dividing a levy by two would give five (and a fraction); hence the term “five-penny-piece,” “fippenny,” or “fip,” for the half real or six and one-quarter cent piece. There are doubtless yet people in Virginia and Maryland who never say “twenty-five cents,” but instead, “two levies and a fip.”

General intelligence had improved, partly from the greater number, better quality, and quicker and fuller distribution of newspapers. Correspondents were numerous. Intelligent persons visiting at a distance from home were wont to write long letters to their local newspapers, containing all the items of interest which they could scrape together. Papers sprung up at every considerable hamlet. Even the Ohio Valley did not lack. Perhaps four and a half million copies a year were issued in the whole country by 1800. They were admitted now—not so, however, under the original postal law—as a regular part of the mails, and thus found their way to nearly all homes. The news which they brought was often old news, of course, post riders requiring twenty-nine and one-half hours between Philadelphia and either New York or Baltimore; but they were read with none the less avidity. Its first mail reached Buffalo in 1803, on horseback. Mail went thither bi-weekly till 1806, then weekly. Postal rates were high, ranging for letters from six cents for thirty miles to twenty-five for four hundred and fifty miles or over. So late as 1796 New York City received mails from North

and from South, and sent mails in both directions, only twice weekly between November 1st and May 1st, and but thrice weekly the rest of the year. In 1794 the great cities enjoyed carriers, who got two cents for each letter delivered. In 1785 there were two dailies, *The Pennsylvania Packet* and *The New York Advertiser*, but, as yet, no Sunday paper appeared, nor any scientific, religious, or illustrated journal, nor any devoted to literature or trade. *The New York Medical Repository* began in 1797, the first scientific periodical in America. In 1801 seventeen dailies existed. Paper was scarce and high, so that appeals were published in most of the news sheets imploring people to save their rags.

The press was more violently partisan and indecently personal than now. To oppose the federalist *United States Gazette* the republican *National Gazette* had been started, which, with brilliant meanness, assailed not only Washington's public acts, but his motives and character. Him, and still more Adams, Hamilton, and the other leading Federalists, it, in nearly every issue, charged with conspiracy to found a monarchy. Republican journals reeked with such doggerel as:

“ See Johnny at the helm of State,  
 Head itching for a crown ;  
 He longs to be, like Georgy, great,  
 And pull Tom Jeffer downy.”<sup>1</sup>

Federalists were not behind in warfare of this sort. Jefferson was the object of their continual

<sup>1</sup> 2 McMaster, 383.

and vilest slander. In New England, the stronghold of Federalism, nearly every Sunday's sermon was an arraignment of the French, and impliedly of their allies, the Republicans.<sup>1</sup> From Jefferson's election — he was a conservative free-thinker — they seemed to anticipate the utter extermination of Christianity, though the man paid in charities, mostly religious, as for Bibles, missionaries, chapels, meeting-houses, etc., one year of his presidency, \$978.20; another year, \$1,585.60. One preacher likened the tribute which Talleyrand demanded of Adams's envoys to that which Sennacherib required of Hezekiah.<sup>2</sup> Another compared Hamilton, killed in a duel, to Abner, the son of Ner, slain by Joab. Another took for his text the message which Hezekiah sent to the Prophet Isaiah: "This is a day of trouble and of rebuke and of contumely," etc. Another attacked Republicanism outright from the words: "There is an accursed thing in the midst of thee, O Israel." The coolest federalist leaders could fall prey to this partisan temper. Lafayette meditated settling in this country. Such was his popularity here that no one would have dared to oppose this openly. Hamilton, however, while favoring it publicly, yet, lest the great Frenchman's coming should help on the republican cause, secretly did his utmost to prevent it. Even Washington, who was human after all, connived, it seems, at this piece of duplicity.

According to a federalist sheet, Hamilton's

<sup>1</sup> 2 McMaster, 383.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 37: 3 seq.

<sup>2</sup> Isaiah, 36.

<sup>4</sup> Joshua, 7: 13.

death called forth "the voice of deep lament" save from "the rancorous Jacobin, the scoffing deist, the snivelling fanatic, and the imported scoundrel." "Were I asked," said an apologist, "whether General Hamilton had vices, in the face of the world, in the presence of my God, I would answer, No." Another poetized of the

"Great day

When Hamilton—disrobed of mortal clay—  
At God's right hand shall sit with face benign,  
And at his murderer cast a look divine."

In 1800 instrumental music might have been heard in some American churches. There were Roman Catholic congregations in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Baltimore had its Catholic bishop. The Protestant Episcopal Church in America had been organized. Methodism, independent of England since 1784, was on its crusade up and down the land, already strong in New York and the South, and in 1790 a Methodist church had been gathered in Boston.

The manufacture of corduroys, bed-ticking, fustian, jeans, and cotton-yarn had been started. Iron ore and iron ware of nearly all sorts was produced. Syracuse was manufacturing salt. Lynn already made morocco leather, and Dedham, straw braid for hats. Cotton was regularly exported in small quantities from the South. In New York one could get a decayed tooth filled or a set of false teeth made. Four daily stages ran between New York and Philadelphia. The Boston ship *Columbia* had circumnavigated the globe. The United

States Mint was still working by horse-power, not employing steam till 1815. Whitney's cotton-gin had been invented in 1793. Terry, of Plymouth, Conn., was making clocks. There were in the land two insurance companies, possibly more. Cast iron ploughs, of home make, were displacing the old ones of wood. Morse's "Geography," and Webster's "Spelling-book" were on the market, and extensively used.

The great industrial inventions which were to color the entire civilization of mankind had a powerful effect upon America. So early as 1775, in England, Crompton's mule-jenny had superseded Hargreaves's spinning machine. The latter had improved on the old spinning-wheel by making eight, and later eighty, threads with the effort and time the old arrangement had required for one; but the threads were no better, and could be used only for woof, linen being required for warp. Arkwright's roller arrangement was an improvement upon Hargreaves's. It bettered the quality of the threads, making them even, so that they could serve for warp as well as woof. Crompton's mule was another quantitative improvement, combining the excellencies of both Hargreave and Arkwright. One man could with this machinery work twenty-two hundred spindles, and they went much faster than by the ancient wheel. Then came steam-power. Watts's engine was adapted to spinning and carding cotton at Manchester in 1783. Two years later the cylinder printing of cottons was invented, and a little after began the use of acid in bleaching.

These mighty industrial devices did not cross to America immediately, but were all here before the time of which we now write. A spinning-jenny was indeed exhibited in Philadelphia so early as 1775. During the Revolution, Philadelphia was a seat of much manufacture. We have in an earlier chapter remarked that Beverly, Mass., had a cotton factory in 1787. Oxen furnished its power, as a horse did that for the first Philadelphia mill. A cotton mill was also started very early at Worcester, but whether in 1780 or 1789 may admit of doubt. There is some evidence that before July, 1790, a cotton factory run by water, with ginning, carding, and spinning machines, the last of eighty-four spindles apiece, was in operation near Statesburg, S. C.; but whether it was successful or not is not known. Oliver Evans was operating a single-flue boiler for steam-power by 1786. Soon after he had one with two flues, and in 1779 a high-pressure or non-condensing engine, the principle of which he is by many believed to have invented. He was the earliest builder of steam-engines in the United States, having in 1804 secured a patent for the high-pressure device. His factory furnished engines to all parts of the country.

England did her best to prevent all knowledge of the new manufacturing machinery from crossing the Atlantic. The Act 21 George III., c. 37, denounced upon any one who should aid toward giving America any tool, machine, or secret relating to manufacture in any branch, a penalty of £200 and one year's imprisonment. In vain. Partly

by smuggling, partly by invention, the new arts soon flourished here as there. Some Scotch artisans who came to Bridgewater, Mass., by invitation from Mr. Hugh Orr, of that town, constructed, about 1786, the first cotton-spinning machines in America, including the Arkwright inventions.

To build and launch the English machinery with full success was, however, reserved for Samuel Slater, a native of Belper, Derbyshire, England, who, in 1790, erected at Pawtucket, R. I., the Old Mill in rear of Mill Street, which still stands and runs. Slater had served his time at the making of cotton-manufacturing machinery with J. Strutt, who had been Arkwright's partner. In Strutt's factory he had risen to be overseer. So thoroughly had he mastered the business that, on arriving here, he found himself able to imitate the foreign machines from memory alone, without model, plan, or measurement. Having gotten his gear in readiness, almost solely with his own hands, December 20, 1790, he started three cards, drawing and roving, also seventy-two spindles, all on the Arkwright plan, the first of the kind ever triumphantly operated on this side of the ocean. President Jackson styled Slater "the father of American manufactures," and 1790 may be taken as the birth-year of the American factory system.

The Tariff, the embargo policy of President Jefferson, and the hatred toward England, taking form in organizations pledged to wear only home-made clothing, all powerfully stimulated the erection of factories. A report in 1810, of Albert

Gallatin, Madison's Secretary of the Treasury, states that by the end of the year preceding, eighty-seven cotton factories had arisen in this country, calculated for eighty thousand spindles. The power loom, however, not used in England till about 1806, did not begin its work here till after the War of 1812.\*

\* See, further, Period II., Chap. VIII.



## CHAPTER IX.

### DEMOCRACY AT THE HELM

By the original mode of election, President and Vice-President could not be separately designated on electors' tickets, so that, soon as party spirit led each elector to vote for the same two men, these two were tied for the first place. This occurred in 1801. The Republican candidates were Jefferson and Burr. Each had the same number of electoral votes, seventy-three, against sixty-five for Adams, sixty-four for Pinckney, and twenty-one for Jay. There being no choice, the election went to the House. This had a federalist majority, but was, by the parity of the two highest candidates, constitutionally shut up to elect between these, both of them Republicans. Jefferson as the abler and from the South, was more than Burr an object of federalist hate. Against Hamilton's advice, to his honor be it remembered, the Federalists agreed to throw their votes for Burr. But the vote then, as to-day in such a case, had to be by States. There were sixteen States, nine being necessary to a choice. In nineteen ballots on February 11th, nine the 12th, one the 13th, four the 14th, one each the 16th and 17th, thirty-five in all, Jefferson every time carried eight States and Burr six, while

Maryland and Vermont were equally divided, and therefore powerless.

The fear at last began to be felt that the Union would go to pieces and the Federalists be to blame. Accordingly, on the 36th ballot, five Federalists from South Carolina, four from Maryland, one from Vermont, and one from Delaware—Mr. Bayard, grandfather to President Cleveland's first Secretary of State—did not vote, enabling the republican members from Vermont and Maryland to cast the votes of those States for Jefferson. Thus, with ten States, he was elected, Burr becoming Vice-President. This crisis led, in 1804, to the XIIth Amendment to the Constitution, which directs each elector to vote for Vice-President as such. There can hardly now be a tie between the two leading presidential candidates, and if there is for any reason delay in electing the President, the Senate may proceed to elect the Vice-President at once. The improvement became manifest when, in 1825, the House again had to elect President, and chose John Quincy Adams over Clay and Jackson.

The Democratic Party proved to have entered upon a long lease of power. For forty years its hold upon affairs was not relaxed, and it was in no wise broken even by the elections of Harrison in 1840 and Tyler in 1848. Nor did it ever appear probable that the Whigs, upon any one of the great issues which divided them from the Democrats, were in a way to win permanent advantage. Not till after 1850 had the ruling dynasty true reason to tremble, and then only at the rise of a

new party, the modern Republicans, inspired by the bold cry of anti-slavery, which the Whigs had never dared to raise.

As to its main outlines, the democratic policy was well foreshadowed in Jefferson's first inaugural. It favored thrift and simplicity in government, involving close limitation of army, navy, and diplomatic corps to positive and tangible needs. It professed peculiar regard for the rights and interests of the common man, whether of foreign or of native parentage. Strict construction of the Constitution, which was to a great extent viewed as a compact of States, was another of its cherished ideas. It also maintained special friendliness for agriculture and commerce. From its strict constructionism sprung, further, its hostility to internal improvements; from this and from its regard to agriculture and commerce resulted its dislike to restrictive tariffs. Particularly after the whig schism, about 1820, did these ideas stand forth definite and pronounced as the authoritative democratic creed. In and from Jackson's time they were more so still.

Yet in most respects Jefferson has remained the typical Democrat. He had genuine faith in the people, in free government, in unfettered individuality. His administration was frugal almost to a fault. He insisted upon making the civil power supreme over the military, and scorned all pretensions on the part of any particular class to rule. In two points only was his democracy ideal rather than illustrative of that which followed, viz., adroitness in giving trend and consistency to legislation,

and non-partisan administration of the civil service. In the former no executive has equalled him, in the latter none since Quincy Adams.

Growing up as a scholar and a gentleman-farmer, with refined tastes, penning the great Declaration, which was early scouted for its abstractions, long minister to France, where abstract ideas made all high politics morbid, the sage of Monticello turned out to be one of the most practical presidents this nation has ever had. If he overdid simplicity in going to the Capitol on horseback to deliver his first inaugural, tying his magnificent horse, Wild-air, to a tree with his own hands, he yet entertained elegantly, and his whole state as President, far from humiliating the nation, as some feared it would, was in happy keeping with its then development and nature. His cabinet, Madison, Gallatin, Dearborn, Smith, and Granger, was in liberal education superior to any other the nation has ever had, every member a college graduate, and the first two men of distinguished research and attainments.

As to the civil service, Jefferson, it is true, made many removals from office, some doubtless unwise and even unjust; but in judging of these we must remember his profound and unquestionably honest conviction that the Federalists lacked patriotism. It was this belief which dictated his prosecution, almost persecution, of Burr, whom Federalists openly befriended and defended.

Aaron Burr was the brilliant grandson of President Edwards. Graduating at Princeton at the early age of seventeen, he studied theology a year,

then law, which on the outbreak of the Revolution he deserted for army life at Boston. He went in Arnold's expedition to Canada, was promoted to be colonel, and served on Washington's staff. In Canada he did service as a spy, disguised as a priest and speaking French or Latin as needed. His legal studies completed, 1783 found him in practice in New York, office at No. 10 Little Queen Street. Both as lawyer and in politics he rose like a meteor, being Hamilton's peer in the one, his superior in the other. Organizing his "Little Band" of young Republicans, spite of federalist opposition and sneers from the old republican chiefs, he became Attorney-general of New York in 1789. In 1791, superseding Schuyler, he was United States senator from that State and in 1800, Vice-President.

Higher he could not mount, as federalist favor cursed him among his own party, yet was too weak to aid him independently. It was kept down by Hamilton, who saw through the man and opposed him with all his might. For this Burr forced him to a duel, and fatally shot him, July 11, 1804.

Indicted for murder, Burr now disappears from politics, but only to emerge in a new *rôle*. During all the early history of our Union the parts beyond the Alleghanies were attached to it by but a slender thread, which Spanish intrigue incessantly sought to cut. At this very time Spain was pensioning men in high station there, including General Wilkinson, commanding our force at New Orleans. Could not Burr detach this district or a

part of it from our Government and make here an empire of his own? Or might he not take it as the base of operations for an attack on Spanish America that should give him an empire there? Some vision of this sort danced before the mad genius's vision, as before that of Hamilton in the Miranda scheme. Many influential persons encouraged him, with how much insight into his plan we shall never know. Wilkinson was one of these. Blennerhassett, whose family and estate Burr irreparably blasted, was another. He expected aid from Great Britain, and from disaffected Mexicans.

From the outset the West proved more loyal than he hoped, and when, at the critical moment, Wilkinson betrayed him, he knew that all was lost. Sinking his chests of arms in the river near Natchez, he took to the Mississippi woods, only to be recognized, arrested by Jefferson's order, and dragged to Richmond to jail. As no overt act was proved, he could not be convicted of treason; and even the trial of him for misdemeanor broke down on technical points. The Federalists stood up for Burr as if he had been their man, while Jefferson on his part pushed the prosecution in a fussy and personal way, ill becoming a President.

Jefferson's most lasting work as national chief-magistrate was his diplomacy in purchasing for the Union the boundless territory beyond the Mississippi, prized then not for its extent or resources, both as yet unknown, but as assuring us free navigation of the river, which sundry French and Spanish plots had demonstrated essential to

the solid loyalty of the West. Louisiana, ceded by France to Spain in 1762, became French again in 1801. Napoleon had intended it as the seat of a colonial power rivalling Great Britain's, but, pressed for money in his new war with that kingdom, concluded to sell. He wished, too, the friendship of the United States against Great Britain, and knew not the worth of what he was bargaining away. Willing to take fifty million francs, he offered for one hundred million, speedily closing with Livingston and Monroe's tender of eighty, we to assume in addition the French spoliation claims of our citizens. The treaty of purchase was signed May 2, 1803, and ratified by the Senate the 17th of the following October.

This stupendous transaction assured to our Republic not only leading hand in the affairs of this continent, but place among the great powers of the world. Its 1,124,685 square miles doubled the national domain. It opened path well toward, if not to, the Pacific, and made ours measureless tracts of agricultural and mining lands, rich as any under the sun. If it originated many of the most perplexing questions which have agitated our national politics, as those relating to slavery in this territory itself, to the acquisitions from Mexico, to the Pacific railways, and to the Indians and the Chinese, all this has been amply compensated by the above and countless other benefits.

Equally brilliant if less impressive was another piece of Jefferson's foreign policy. He might be over-friendly to France, but elsewhere he certainly

did not believe in peace at any price. The Barbary powers had begun to annoy our commerce soon after Independence. The *Betsey* was captured in 1784, next year the *Maria*, of Boston, and the *Dauphin*, of Philadelphia, and their crews of twenty-one men carried to a long and disgraceful captivity in Algiers.

The Dey's bill for these captives held by him as slaves, was :

3 Captains at \$6,000.....	\$18,000
2 Mates at \$4,000.....	8,000
2 Passengers at \$4,000.....	8,000
14 Seamen at \$1,400.....	9,600
	<hr/>
	\$53,600
For custom, eleven per cent.....	5,896
	<hr/>
	\$59,496

Later a single cruise lost us ten vessels to these half civilized people.

Following European precedent, Washington had made, in 1795, a ransom-treaty with this nest of pirates, to carry out which cost us a fat million. The captives had meantime increased to one hundred and fifteen, though the crews of the *Maria* and the *Dauphin* had wasted away to ten men. Nearly a million more went to the other North-African freebooters. The policy of ransoming was, indeed, cheaper than force. Count d'Estaing used to say that bombarding a pirate town was like breaking windows with guineas. The old Dey of Algiers, learning the expense of Du Quesne's expedition to



batter his capital, declared that he himself would have burnt it for half the sum.

Yet it makes one's blood hot to-day to read how our fathers paid tribute to those thieves. The Dey had, in so many words, called us his slaves, and had actually terrorized Captain Bainbridge, of the *Man-of-War* *George Washington*, into carrying dispatches for him to Constantinople, flying the Algerine pirate flag conspicuously at the fore. After anchoring—this was some requital—Bainbridge was permitted to hoist the Stars and Stripes, the first time that noble emblem ever kissed the breeze of the Golden Horn.

Jefferson loathed such submission, and vowed that it should cease. Commodore Dale was ordered to the Mediterranean with a squadron to protect our ships there from further outrage. One of his vessels, the *Experiment*, soon captured a Tripoli cruiser of fourteen guns, the earliest stroke of any civilized power for many years by way of showing a bold front to these pestilent corsairs.

This was on August 6, 1801. In 1803 Preble was placed in command of the Mediterranean fleet, with some lighter ships to go farther up those shallow harbors. Bainbridge had the misfortune while in pursuit of a Tripoli frigate to run his ship, the *Philadelphia*, on a rock, and to be taken prisoner with all his crew. The sailors were made slaves. Lieutenant Decatur penetrated the Tripoli harbor under cover of night, and burned the *Philadelphia* to the water's edge. Tripoli was bombarded, and many of its vessels taken or sunk. Commodore Barron, who had succeeded Preble,

co-operated with a land attack which some of the Pasha's disaffected subjects, led by the American General Eaton, made upon Tripoli. The city was captured, April 27th, and the pirate prince forced to a treaty. Even now, however, we paid \$60,000 in ransom money.

## CHAPTER X.

### THE WAR OF 1812

ALTHOUGH paying, so long as Jay's treaty was in force, for certain invasions of our commerce, Great Britain had never adopted a just attitude toward neutral trade. She persisted in loosely defining contraband and blockade, and in denouncing as unlawful all commerce which was opened to us as neutrals merely by war or carried on by us between France and French colonies through our own ports.

The far more flagrant abuse of impressment, the forcible seizure of American citizens for service in the British navy, became intolerably prevalent during Jefferson's administration. Not content with reclaiming deserters or asserting the eternity of British citizenship, Great Britain, through her naval authorities, was compelling thousands of men of unquestioned American birth to help fight her battles. Castlereagh himself admitted that there had been sixteen hundred *bona fide* cases of this sort by January 1, 1811. And in her mode of asserting and exercising even her just claims she ignored international law, as well as the dignity and sovereignty of the United States. The odious right of search she most shamefully

abused. The narrow seas about England were assumed to be British waters, and acts performed in American harbors admissible only on the open ocean. When pressed by us for apology or redress, the British Government showed no serious willingness to treat, but a brazen resolve to utilize our weak and too trustful policy of peace.

One instance of this shall suffice. Commodore Barron, in command of the United States war vessel *Chesapeake*, was attacked by the *Leopard*, a British two-decker of fifty guns, outside the mouth of Chesapeake Bay, to recover three sailors, falsely alleged to be British-born, on board. Their surrender being refused, the *Leopard* opened fire. The *Chesapeake* received twenty-one shots in her hull, and lost three of her crew killed and eighteen wounded. She had been shamefully unprepared for action, and was hence forced to strike, but Humphreys, the *Leopard's* commander, contemptuously declined to take her a prize. There was no excuse whatever for this wanton and criminal insult to our flag, yet the only reparation ever made was formal, tardy, and lame.

Bad was changed to worse with the progress of the new and more desperate war between Great Britain and Napoleon. The Emperor shut the North-German ports to Britain; Britain declared Prussian and all West European harbors in a state of blockade. The Emperor's Berlin decree, November, 1806, paper-blockaded the British Isles; his Milan decree, December, 1807, declared forfeited all vessels, wherever found, proceeding to or from any British port, or having submitted to Brit-

ish search or tribute. In fine, Britain would treat as illicit all commerce with the continent, France all with Britain. But while Napoleon, in fact, though not avowedly, more and more receded from his position, England maintained hers with iron tenacity.

Sincere as was our Government's desire to maintain strict neutrality in the European conflict, it naturally found difficulty in making England so believe. Their opponents at home ceaselessly charged Jefferson, Madison, and all the Republicans with partiality to France, so that Canning and Castlereagh were misled; and they were confirmed in their suspicion by Napoleon's crafty assumption that our embargo or non-intercourse policy was meant to act, as it confessedly did, favorably to France. Napoleon's confiscation of our vessels, at one time sweeping, he advertised as a friendly proceeding in aid of our embargo. Yet all this did not, as Castlereagh captiously pretended, prove our neutrality to be other than strict and honest. At this time it certainly was both. So villainously had Napoleon treated us that all Americans now hated him as heartily as did any people in England.

The non-intercourse mode of hostility, a boomerang at best, had played itself out before Jefferson's retirement; and since George's ministry showed no signs whatever of a changed temper, guiltily ill-prepared as we were, no honorable or safe course lay before us but to fight Great Britain. Clay, Calhoun, Quincy Adams, and Monroe—the last the soul of the war—deserved the credit of

seeing this first and clearest, and of the most sturdy and consistent action accordingly. Their spirit proved infectious, and the Republicans swiftly became a war party.

Most of the "war-hawks," as they were derisively styled, were from the South and the southern Middle States. Fearing that, if it were a naval war, glory would redound to New England and New York, which were hotbeds of the peace party, they wished this to be a land war, and shrieked, "On to Canada." They made a great mistake. The land operations were for the most part indescribably disgraceful. Except the exploits of General Brown and Colonel Winfield Scott, subsequently the head of the national armies, not an action on the New York border but ingloriously failed. The national Capitol was captured and burnt, a deed not more disgraceful to England in the commission than to us in the permission. Of the officers in command of armies, only Harrison and Jackson earned laurels.

Harrison had learned warfare as Governor of Indiana, where, on November 7, 1811, he had fought the battle of Tippecanoe, discomfiting Tecumseh's braves and permanently quieting Indian hostilities throughout that territory. In the new war against England, after Hull's pusillanimous surrender of Detroit, the West loudly and at length with success demanded "Tippecanoe" as commander for the army about to advance into Canada. Their estimate of Harrison proved just. Overcoming many difficulties and aided by Perry's flotilla on Lake Erie, he pursued Proctor, his re-

treating British antagonist, up the River Thames to a point beyond Sandwich. Here the British made a stand, but a gallant charge of Harrison's Kentucky cavalry irreparably broke their lines. The Indians, led by old Tecumseh in person, made a better fight, but in vain. The victory was complete, and Upper Canada lay at our mercy.

Andrew Jackson also began his military experience by operations against Indians. The southern redskins had been incited to war upon us by British and Spanish emissaries along the Florida line. Tecumseh had visited them in the same interest. The horrible massacre at Fort Mims, east of the Alabama above its junction with the Tombigbee, was their initial work. Five hundred and fifty persons were there surprised, four hundred of them slain or burned to death. Jackson took the field, and in an energetic campaign, with several bloody engagements, forced them to peace. By the battle of the Horse-Shoe, March 27, 1814, the Creek power was entirely crushed.

Subsequently placed in command of our force at New Orleans, Jackson was attacked by a numerous British army, made up in large part of veterans who had seen service under Wellington in Spain. Pakenham, the hero of Salamanca, commanded. Jackson's position was well chosen and strongly fortified. After several preliminary engagements, each favorable to the American arms, Pakenham essayed to carry the American works by storm. The battle occurred on January 8, 1815. It was desperately fought on both sides, but at its close Jackson's loss had been trifling and his line had

not been broken at a single point, while the British had lost at least 2,600, all but 500 of these killed or wounded. The British immediately withdrew from the Mississippi, leaving Jackson entirely master of the position.

But the naval operations of this war were far the most famous, exceeding in their success all that the most sanguine had dared to hope, and forever dispelling from our proud foe the charm of naval invincibility. The American frigate *Constitution* captured the British *Guerriere*. The *Wasp* took the *Frolic*, being soon, however, forced to surrender with her prize to the *Poitiers*, a much larger vessel. The United States vanquished the *Macedonian*, and the *Constitution* the *Java*. One of the best fought actions of the war was that of McDonough on Lake Champlain, with his craft mostly gun-boats or galleys. His victory restored to us the possession of Northern New York, which our land forces had not been able to maintain.

The crowning naval triumph during the war, one of the most brilliant, in fact, in all naval annals, was won by Oliver Hazard Perry near Put-in-Bay on Lake Erie, September 10, 1813, over the Briton, Barclay, a naval veteran who had served under Nelson at Trafalgar. The fleets were well matched, the American numbering the more vessels but the fewer guns. Barclay greatly exceeded Perry in long guns, having the latter at painful disadvantage until he got near. Perry's flag-ship, the *Lawrence*, was early disabled. Her decks were drenched with blood, and she had hardly a gun that could be served. Undismayed, Perry, with his insignia



of command, crossed in a little boat to the Niagara. Again proudly hoisting his colors, aided by the wind and followed by his whole squadron, he pressed for close quarters, where desperate fighting speedily won the battle. Barclay and his next in command were wounded, the latter dying that night. "We have met the enemy and they are ours," Perry wrote to Harrison, "two ships, two brigs, one schooner, and one sloop."

Triumph far more complete might have attended the war but for the perverse and factious federalist opposition to the administration. Some Federalists favored joining England out and out against Napoleon. Having with justice denounced Jefferson's embargo tactics as too tame, yet when the war spirit rose and even the South stood ready to resent foreign affronts by force, they changed tone, harping upon our weakness and favoring peace at any price. Tireless in magnifying the importance of commerce, they would not lift a hand to defend it. The same men who had cursed Adams for avoiding war with France easily framed excuses for orders in council, impressment, and the Chesapeake affair.

Apart from Randolph and the few opposition Republicans, mostly in New York, this Thersites band had its seat in commercial New England, where embargo and war of course sat hardest, more than a sixth of our entire tonnage belonging to Massachusetts alone. From the Essex Junto and its sympathizers came nullification utterances not less pointed than the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, although, considering the sound rebukes which the

latter had evoked, they were far less defensible. Disunion was freely threatened and actions either committed or countenanced bordering hard upon treason. The Massachusetts Legislature in 1809 declared Congress's act to enforce embargo "not legally binding." Governor Trumbull of Connecticut declined to aid, as requested by the President, in carrying out that act, summoning the Legislature "to interpose their protecting shield" between the people and "the assumed power of the general Government." "How," wrote Pickering, referring to the Constitution, Amendment X., "are the powers reserved to be maintained, but by the respective States judging for themselves and putting their negative on the usurpations of the general Government?" A sermon of President Dwight's on the text, "Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord," even Federalists deprecated as hinting too strongly at secession. This unpatriotic agitation, from which, be it said, large numbers of Federalists nobly abstained, came to a head in the mysterious Hartford Convention, at the close of 1814, and soon began to be sedulously hushed in consequence of the glorious news of victory and peace from Ghent and New Orleans.

While the Congregationalists, especially their clergy, were nearly all stout Federalists, opposing Jefferson, Madison, and the war, the Methodists and Baptists<sup>1</sup> almost to a man stood up for the

<sup>1</sup> The writer's grandfather, a Baptist minister, was as good as driven from his pulpit and charge at Templeton, Mass., because of his federalist sympathies in this war.

administration and its war policy with the utmost vigor, rebuking the peace party as traitors. Timothy Merritt, a mighty Methodist preacher on the Connecticut circuit, has left us from these critical times a stirring sermon on the text, Judges v. 23, "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." Meroz was the federalist party and England's ministry and army were "the mighty."

Czar Alexander, regarding our hostility as dangerous to England, with whom he then stood allied against Napoleon, sought to end the war. The Russian campaign of 1812 practically finished Napoleon's career, so leaving England free to press operations in America. In April, 1814, Paris was captured. The United States therefore accepted Alexander's offices. Our commissioners, Adams, Clay, Gallatin, Marshall, Bayard, and Russell met the English envoys at Ghent, and after long discussions, in which more than once it seemed as if the war must proceed, the treaty of Ghent was executed, December 24, 1814, some months before the battle of New Orleans.

It was an honorable peace. If we gained no territory we yielded none. The questions of Mississippi navigation and the fisheries were expressly reserved for future negotiations. Upon impressment and the abuse of neutrals, exactly the grievances over which we had gone to war, the treaty was silent, and peace men laughed at the war party on this account, calling the war a failure.

The ridicule was unjust. Had Napoleon been still on high, or the negotiations been subsequent to the New Orleans victory, England would doubtless have been called upon to renounce these practices. But experience has proved that such a demand would have been unnecessary. No outrage of these kinds has occurred since, nor can anyone doubt that it was our spirit as demonstrated in the war of 1812 which changed England's temper. Hence, in spite of our military inexperience, financial distress, internal dissensions, and the fall of Napoleon, which unexpectedly turned the odds against us, the war was a success.

## PERIOD II.

### *WHIGS AND DEMOCRATS TILL THE DOMINANCE OF THE SLAVERY CONTROVERSY*

1814-1840

#### CHAPTER I.

##### THE WHIG PARTY AND ITS MISSION

THE term "whig" is of Scotch origin. During the bloody conflict of the Covenanters with Charles II. nearly all the country people of Scotland sided against the king. As these peasants drove into Edinburgh to market, they were observed to make great use of the word "whiggam" in talking to their horses. Abbreviated to "whig," it speedily became, and has in England and Scotland ever since remained, a name for the opponents of royal power. It was so employed in America in our revolutionary days. Sinking out of hearing after Independence, it reappeared for fresh use when schism came in the overgrown Democratic Party.

The republican predominance after 1800, so complete, bidding so fair to be permanent, drew all the more fickle Federalists speedily to that side. Since it was evident that the new party was

quite as national in spirit as the ruling element of the old, the Adams Federalists, those most patriotic, least swayed in their politics by commercial motives, including Marshall, the War Federalists, and the recruits enlisted at the South during Adams's administration, also went over, in sympathy if not in name, to Republicanism. The fortunate issue of the war silenced every carper, and the ten years following have been well named the "era of good feeling."

But though for long very harmonious, yet, so soon as Federalists began swelling their ranks, the Republicans ceased to be a strictly homogeneous party. Incipient schism appeared by 1812, at once announced and widened by the creation of the protective system and the new United States Bank in 1816, and the attempted launching of an internal improvements *régime* in 1821, all three the plain marks of federalist survival, however men might shun that name. Republicans like Clay, Calhoun in his early years, and Quincy Adams, while somewhat more obsequious to the people, as to political theory differed from old Federalists in little but name. The same is true of Clinton, candidate against Madison for the Presidency in 1812, and of many who supported him.

But to drive home fatally the wedge between "democratic" and "national" Republicans, required Jackson's quarrel with Adams and Clay in 1825, when, the election being thrown into the House, although Jackson had ninety-nine electoral votes to Adams's eighty-four, Crawford's forty-one, and Clay's thirty-seven, Clay's supporters,

by a "corrupt bargain," as Old Hickory alleged, voted for Adams and made him President. Hickory's idea—an untenable one—was that the House was bound to elect according to the tenor of the popular and the electoral vote. After all this, however, so potent the charm of the old party, the avowal of a purpose to build up a new one did not work well, Clay polling in 1832 hardly half the electoral vote of Adams in 1828. This democratic gain was partly owing, it is true, to Jackson's popularity, to the belief that he had been wronged in 1825, and to the widening of the franchise which had long been going on in the nation. Calhoun's election as Vice-President in 1828, by a large majority, shows that party crystallization was then far from complete. From about 1834, the new political body thus gradually evolved was regularly called the Whigs, though the name had been heard ever since 1825.

The doctrines characteristic of Whiggism were chiefly five :

I. *Broad Construction of the Constitution.* This has been sufficiently explained in the chapter on Federalism and Anti-Federalism, and need not be dwelt upon. The whig attitude upon it appears in all that follows.

II. *The Bank.* The First United States Bank had perished by the expiration of its charter in 1811. It had been very useful, indeed almost indispensable, in managing the national finances, and its decease, with the consequent financial disorder, was a most terrible drawback in the war. Re-charter was, however, by a very small majority,

refused. The evils flowing from this perverse step manifesting themselves day by day, a new Bank of the United States, modelled closely after the first, was chartered on April 10, 1816, Clay, Calhoun, and Webster being its chief champions. Republican opponents, Madison among them, were brought around by the plea that war had proved a national bank a necessary and hence a constitutional helper of the Government in its appointed work.

In the management of this second bank there were disorder and dishonesty, which greatly limited its usefulness. This, notwithstanding, was considerable. The credit of the nation was restored and its treasury resumed specie payments. But confidence in the institution was shaken. We shall see how it met with President Jackson's opposition on every possible occasion. In 1832 he vetoed a bill for the renewal of its charter, to expire in 1836, and in 1833 caused all the Government's deposits in it, amounting to ten million dollars, to be removed. These blows were fatal to the bank, though it secured a charter from Pennsylvania and existed, languishing, till 1839.

III. *The Tariff.* Until the war of 1812 the main purpose of our tariff policy had been revenue, with protection only as an incident. During the war manufacturing became largely developed, partly through our own embargo, partly through the armed hostilities. Manufacture had grown to be an extensive interest, comparing in importance with agriculture and commerce. Therefore, in the new tariff of 1816, the old relation was reversed, protection being made the main aim and revenue



the incident. It is curious to note that this first protective tariff was championed and passed by the Republicans and bitterly opposed by the Federalists and incipient Whigs. Webster argued and inveighed vehemently against it, appealing to the curse of commercial restriction and of governmental interference with trade, and to the low character of manufacturing populations.

But very soon the tables were turned: the Whigs became the high-tariff party, the Democrats more and more opposing this policy in favor of a low or a revenue tariff. It should be marked that even now the idea of protection in its modern form was not the only one which went to make a high tariff popular. There were, besides, the wish to be prepared for war by the home production of war material, and also the spirit of commercial retortion, paying back in her own coin England's burdensome tax upon our exports to her shores.

IV. *Land.* What may not improperly be styled the whig land policy sprung from the whig sentiment for large customs duties. Cheap public lands, offering each poor man a home for the taking, constantly tended to neutralize the effect of duties, by raising wages in the manufacturing sections, people needing a goodly bribe to enter mills in the East when an abundant living was theirs without money and without price on removing west. As a rule, therefore, though this question did not divide the two parties so crisply as the others, the Whigs opposed the free sale of government land, while the Democrats favored that policy. In spite of this, however, eastern people who moved

westward—and they constituted the West's main population—quite commonly retained their whig politics even upon the tariff question itself.

V. *Internal Improvements.* It has always been admitted that Congress may lay taxes to build and improve light-houses, public docks, and all such properties whereof the United States is to hold the title. The general improvement of harbors, on the other hand, the constitution meant to leave to the States, allowing each to cover the expense by levying tonnage duties. The practice for years corresponded with this. The inland commonwealths, however, as they were admitted, justly regarded this unfair unless offset by Government's aid to them in the construction of roads, canals, and river ways.

The War of 1812 revealed the need of better means for direct communication with the remote sections of the Union. Transportation to Detroit had cost fifty cents per pound of ammunition, sixty dollars per barrel of flour. All admitted that improved internal routes were necessary. The question was whether the general Government had a right to construct them without amendment to the constitution.

The Whigs, like the old Federalists, affirmed such right, appealing to Congress's power to establish post-roads, wage war, supervise inter-state trade, and conserve the common defence and general welfare. As a rule, the Democrats, being strict constructionists, denied such right. Some of them justified outlay upon national rivers and commercial harbors under the congressional power of

raising revenue and regulating commerce. Others conceded the rightfulness of subsidies to States even for bettering inland routes. Treasury surplus at times, and the many appropriations which, by common consent, had been made under Monroe and later for the old National Road, encouraged the whig contention ; but the whig policy had never met general approval down to the time when the whole question was taken out of politics by the rise of the railroad system after 1832. The National Road, meantime, extending across Ohio and Indiana on its way to St. Louis, was made over in 1830 to the States through which it passed.

The Whig Party deserves great praise as the especial repository, through several decades, of the spirit of nationality in our country. It cherished this, and with the utmost boldness proclaimed doctrines springing from it, at a time when the Democracy, for no other reason than that it had begun as a state rights party, foolishly combated these. Yet Whiggism was mightier in theories than in deeds, in political cunning than in statesmanship. It was far too fearful, on the whole, lest the country should not be sufficiently governed. To secure power it allied itself now with the Anti-Masons, strong after 1826 in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania ; and again with the Nullifiers of South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee, led by Calhoun, Troup, and White. It did the latter by making Tyler, an out-and-out Nullifier, its Vice-President in 1840.

A leading Whig during nearly all his political career was John Quincy Adams, one of the ablest,

most patriotic, and most successful president this country has ever had. He possessed a thorough education, mainly acquired abroad, where, sojourning with his distinguished father, he had enjoyed while still a youth better opportunities for diplomatic training than many of our diplomatists have known in a lifetime. He went to the United States Senate in 1803 as a Federalist. Disgusted with that party, he turned Republican, losing his place. From 1806 to 1809 he was professor in Harvard College. In the latter year Madison sent him Minister to St. Petersburg. He was commissioner at Ghent, then Minister to England, then Monroe's Secretary of State, then President.

But Mr. Adams's best work was done in the House of Representatives after he was elected to that body in 1830. He sat in the House until his death, in 1848—its acknowledged leader in ability, in activity, and in debate. Friend and foe hailed him as the "Old Man Eloquent," nor were any there anxious to be pitted against him. He spoke upon almost every great national question, each time displaying general knowledge, legal lore, and keenness of analysis surpassed by no American of his or any age.

Webster was, however, the great orator of the party. Reared upon a farm and educated at Dartmouth College, he went to Congress from New Hampshire as a Federalist in 1813. Removing to Boston, he soon entered Congress from Massachusetts, first as representative, then as senator, and from 1827 was in the Senate almost continuously till 1850. He was Secretary of State under Harri-

son and Tyler, and again in the Taylor-Fillmore cabinet from 1850.

As an orator Webster had no peer in his time, nor have the years since evoked his peer. He was an influential party leader, and repeatedly thought of for President, though too prominent ever to be nominated. On two momentous questions, the tariff and slavery, he vacillated, his dubious action concerning the latter costing him his place in the Senate and his popularity in New England.

Yet in many respects the most interesting figure in the party was Henry Clay. He was born amid the swamps of Hanover County, Va., and had grown up in most adverse surroundings. His father, a Baptist clergyman, died while he was an infant, leaving him destitute. In "The Slashes," as the neighborhood where Clay passed his childhood was called, he might often have been seen astride a sorry horse with a rope bridle and no saddle, carrying his bag of grain to the mill. He had attended only district schools. After obtaining the rudiments of a legal education in Richmond by service as a lawyer's clerk, he removed to Kentucky. He was soon famous as a criminal lawyer, and a little later as a politician. The rest of his life was spent in Congress or cabinet.

Clay's speeches read ill, but were powerful in their delivery. He spoke directly to the heart. As he proceeded, his tall and awkward form swayed with passion. His voice was sweet and winsome. Once Tom Marshall was to face him in joint debate over a salary grab for which Clay had voted. Clay had the first word, and as he warmed to his

work Marshall slunk away through the crowd in despair. "Come back," said Clay's haters to him; "you can answer every point." "Of course," replied Marshall, "but I can't get up there and do it now." The common people shouted for Clay as they shouted for neither Webster nor Adams. He had infinite fund of anecdote, remembered everyone he had ever seen, and was kindly to all. John Tyler is said to have wept when Clay failed of the presidential nomination in the Whig Convention of 1839.

Clay's vices and inconsistencies were readily forgiven. He had denounced duelling as barbarous, yet when sharp-tongued John Randolph referred to him and Adams as having, in 1825, formed "the coalition of Blifil and Black George, the combination of the Puritan and the blackleg"—for Clay gambled—Clay challenged him. They met, the diminutive Randolph being in his dressing-gown. Neither was hurt, as Randolph fired in air and Clay was no shot. Being asked why he did not kill Randolph, Clay said: "I aimed at the part of his gown where I thought he was, but when the bullet got there he had moved." In 1842, when Lord Ashburton was in Washington, there was a famous whist game, my lord, with Mr. Crittenden, playing against Clay and the Russian Minister, Count Bodisco, while Webster looked on. "What shall the stake be?" asked his lordship. "Out of deference to Her Majesty," said Clay, "we will make it a sovereign."

Emphatically patriotic, super-eminent in debate, ambitious, adventurous in political diplomacy, a

hard worker, incessant in activity for his party, temperate upon the slavery question, whole-souled in every measure or policy calculated to advance nationality, this versatile man may be put down as foremost among the leaders of the Whig Party from its origin till his death.

## CHAPTER II.

### FLORIDA AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

IT was a delicate question after the Louisiana purchase how much territory it embraced east of the Mississippi. Louisiana had under France, till 1762, reached the Perdido, Florida's western boundary at present, and was "retroceded" by Spain to France in 1800 "with the same extent that it had when France possessed it." The United States of course succeeded to whatever France thus recovered. Spain claimed still to own West Florida, the name given by Great Britain on receiving it from France in 1763 to the part of Louisiana between the Perdido and the Mississippi. Spain had never acquired the district from France but obtained it by conquest from Great Britain during our Revolution.

This claim by Spain, based only on the "retro" in the treaty of 1800, our Government viewed as fanciful, regarding West Florida undoubtedly ours through the Louisiana purchase. Spain was intractable, first of herself, later still more so through Napoleon's dictation. Hence our offer, in Jefferson's time, to avoid war, of a lump sum for the two Floridas was spurned by her. In 1810 and 1811, to save it from anarchy—also to save it from Great Britain or France, now in the whitest heat of their



contest for Spain—we occupied West Florida, as certainly entitled to it against those powers, yet with no view of precluding further negotiations with Spain. When in 1812 Louisiana became a State, its eastern boundary ran as now, including a goodly portion of the region in debate.

The necessity of acquiring East Florida, too, was more and more apparent. That country was without rule, full of filibusterers, privateers, hostile refugee Creeks and runaway negroes, of whose services the English had availed themselves freely during the war of 1812, when Spaniards and English made Florida a perpetual base for hostile raids into our territory. A fort then built by the English on the Appalachiecola and left intact at the peace with some arms and ammunition, had been occupied by the negroes, who, from this retreat, menaced the peace beyond the line. Spain could not preserve law and order here. This was perhaps a sufficient excuse for the act of General Gaines in crossing into Florida and bombarding the negro fort, July 27, 1816. Amelia Island, on the Florida coast, a nest of lawless men from every nation, was in 1817 also seized by the United States with the same propriety. Knowledge that Spain resented these acts encouraged the Floridians. Collisions continually occurred all along the line, finally growing into general hostility. Such was the origin of the First Seminole War.

December, 1817, Jackson was placed in command in Georgia. To clear out the filibusterers, the chief source of the Indians' discontent ever since before the Creek War, the hero of New Orleans,

mistakenly supposing himself to be fortified by his Government's concurrence, boldly took forcible possession of all East Florida. Ambrister and Arbuthnot, two officious English subjects found there, he put to death.

This procedure was quite characteristic of Old Hickory. He acted upon the theory that by the law of nations any citizen of one land making war upon another land, the two being at peace, becomes an outlaw. International law has no such doctrine, and most likely the maxim occurred to Jackson rather as an excuse after the act than in the way of forethought. Nor was it ever proved that the two victims were guilty as Jackson alleged. With him this probably made little difference. Having undertaken to quiet the Floridian outbreaks he was determined to accomplish his end, whatever the consequences of some of his means.

With the country the New Orleans victor, who had now dared to hang a British subject, was ten times a hero, but the deed confused and troubled Monroe's cabinet not a little. Calhoun wished General Jackson censured, while all his cabinet colleagues disapproved his high-handed acts and stood ready to disavow them with reparation. On this occasion Jackson owed much to one whom he subsequently hated and denounced, viz., Quincy Adams, by whose bold and acute defence of his doubtful doings, managed with a fineness of argument and diplomacy which no then American but Adams could command, he was formally vindicated before both his own Government and the Governments of England and Spain.

The posts seized had of course to be given up, yet our bold invasion had rendered Spain willing at last to sell Florida, while Great Britain, wishing our countenance in her opposition to the anti-progressive, misnamed Holy Alliance of continental monarchs, concurred. Spain after all got the better of the bargain, as we surrendered all claim to Texas, which the Louisiana purchase had really made ours.

The Florida imbroglio nursed to its first public utterance a sentiment which has ever since been spontaneously taken as a principle of American public policy, almost as if it were a part of our law itself. Spain's American dependencies had been sensible enough to avail themselves of that land's distraction in Napoleon's time, to set up as states on their own account. She naturally wanted them back. Ferdinand VII. withheld till 1820 his signature of the treaty ceding Florida, in order to prevent—which, after all, it did not—our recognition of these revolted provinces as independent nations. Backed by the powerful Austrian minister, Metternich, and by the Holy Alliance, France, having aided Ferdinand to suppress at home the liberal rebellion of 1820-23, began to moot plans for subduing the new Spanish-American States. Great Britain opposed this, out of motives partly commercial, partly philanthropic, partly relating to international law, yet was unwilling so early to recognize the independence of those nations as the United States had done.

Assured at least of England's moral support, President Monroe in his message of December,

1823, declared that we should consider any attempt on the part of the allied monarchs "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety," and any interposition by them to oppress the young republics or to control their destiny, "as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." This, in kernel, is the first part of Monroe's doctrine.

The second part added: "The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." The meaning of this was that the mere hap of first occupancy on the continent by the citizens of any country would not any longer be recognized by us as giving that country a title to the spot occupied.

These important doctrines—for though akin in principle they are really two—were no sudden creation of individual thought, but the result rather of slow processes in the public mind. Germs of the first are traceable to Washington; express statements of both, yet not essentially detracting from Monroe's originality, to Jefferson. Both were put in form by Quincy Adams, Monroe's Secretary of State. Especially Monroe's, we believe, is the second, a resolution to which Russia's advance down the Pacific coast, and more still the recent vexations from the proximity of Spain in Florida, had pushed him.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE

LOUISIANA having become a State in 1812, that portion of the purchase north of the thirty-third degree took the name of the Missouri Territory. St. Louis was its centre of population and of influence.

Being found in this extensive domain at the purchase, slavery had never been hindered in its growth. It had therefore taken firm root and was popular. The application, early in 1818, of the densest part of Missouri Territory for admission into the Union as a slave State, called attention to this threatening status of slavery beyond the Mississippi, and occasioned in Congress a prolonged, able, angry, and momentous debate. Jefferson, still alive, wrote, "The Missouri question is the most portentous which has ever threatened the Union. In the gloomiest hour of the Revolutionary War I never had apprehensions equal to those which I feel from this source."

To see the bearing of the tremendous question thus raised, we have need of a retrospect. Property in man is older than history and has been nearly universal. It cannot be doubted that in an early stage of human development slavery is a

means of furthering civilization. Negro slavery originated in Africa, spread to Spain before the discovery of America, to America soon after, and from the Spanish colonies to the English. The first notice we have of it in English America is that in 1619 a Dutch ship landed twenty blacks at Jamestown for sale. The Dutch West India Company began importing slaves into Manhattan in 1626. There were slaves in New England by 1637. Newport was subsequently a great harbor for slavers. Georgia offered the strongest resistance to the introduction of the system, but it was soon overcome. Till about 1700, Virginia had a smaller proportion of slave population than some northern colonies, and the change later was mostly due to considerations not of morality but of profit. Anti-slavery cries were indeed heard from an early period, but they were few and faint. Penn held slaves, though ordering their emancipation at his death. Whitfield thought slavery to be of God. But its most culpable abettor was the English Government, moved by the profits of the slave trade. A Royal African Company, with the Duke of York, afterward James II., for some time its president, was formed to monopolize this business, which monarchs and ministries furthered to the utmost of their power.

Thus the Revolution found slavery in all the colonies, north as well as south. But it was then, so far south as Virginia, thought to be an evil. That commonwealth had passed many laws to restrain it, but the King had commanded the Governor not to assent to any of them. The Legislature, replying, stigmatized the traffic as inhuman

and a threat to the very existence of the colony. Hostility extended from the trade to slavery itself. Jefferson was for emancipation with deportation, and trembled for his country as he reflected upon the wrong of slavery and the justice of God. Patrick Henry, George Mason, Peyton Randolph, Washington, Madison, in a word all the great Virginians of the time held similar views.

The Quakers of Pennsylvania were, however, the most aggressive of slavery's foes. So early as 1775 a society, the first in America if not in the world for promoting its abolition, was formed in Pennsylvania. In 1789 it was incorporated, with Franklin for president. Similar organizations soon rose in several Northern States, numbering among their members many of the most eminent men in the land. The British Abolition Society, formed in 1787, and the labors of Wilberforce, Clarkson, and Zachary Macaulay against the slave trade in the West Indies, had influence here, as had still more the French Assembly's bold proclamation of the Rights of Man.

The Ordinance of 1787 for the Northwest Territory marked a most decisive point in the history of slavery. By its decree, in Jefferson's language, there was never to be either slavery or involuntary servitude in the said territory otherwise than in punishment for crimes. It is to the everlasting honor of the southern members then in the Continental Congress that they all voted for this inhibition. Virginia, whose assent as a State was necessary to its validity, she having at this time rights over much of the domain in question, also con-

curred. Whatever the strictly legal weight of this prohibition over the immense Louisiana purchase, it certainly aided much in confirming freedom as the presupposition and maxim of our law over all our national territory.

Vermont had never recognized slavery save to prohibit it in its first constitution. In New Hampshire it existed but nominally. The Massachusetts constitution of 1780 virtually ended it in that State. Gradual abolition statutes passed in Pennsylvania in 1780, in Rhode Island and Connecticut in 1784. The constitution made it possible to forbid the importation of slaves in 1808. A national law to that effect was passed in 1807, making the trade illegal and affixing to it heavy penalties. The American Colonization Society was formed in 1816 for the purpose of negro deportation. It did little of this, but rendered some service toward carrying out the act against slave importation. A new law in 1820, which made this traffic piracy, punishable with death, was partly due to its influence. Also many, like Birney, Gerrit Smith and the Tappans, who began as colonizationists, subsequently became abolitionists.

Notwithstanding all these influences slavery increased in strength every year. South Carolina and Georgia were finding it exceedingly profitable for cotton and rice culture, and the income from slave traffic into the vast opening lands of Tennessee and Kentucky constituted an irresistible temptation. In spite of the law of 1807 and of the indescribable horrors of the business, even the foreign slave trade went on. The institution found many



defenders in the Federal Convention of 1787, and in the first and subsequent Congresses. The pleas began to be raised, so current later, that the negro was an inferior being, slavery God's ordinance, a blessing to slaves and masters alike, and emancipation a folly. Now began also that policy of bravado by which, for sixty years, the friends of slavery bullied their opponents into shameful inaction upon that accursed thing politically as well as morally, which was so nearly to cost the nation its life. Thus stood matters when the Missouri Compromise was mooted in the national Legislature.

We hardly need say that this strife ended in a compromise. Missouri was created a slave State, balanced by Maine as a free State, but at the same time slavery was to be excluded forever from all the remainder of the Louisiana purchase north of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ , the southern line of Virginia and Kentucky as well as of Missouri itself. The land between Missouri and Louisiana had been in 1819 erected into the "Territory of Arkansaw."

In the memorable discussion over this issue, involving the country as well as Congress, two sorts of argumentation were heard in favor of the suit of Missouri. The genuine pro-slavery men urged the sacredness of property as such, and the special sacredness of property-right in slaves as tacitly guaranteed by the constitution. They also made much of the third article of the Louisiana purchase treaty. This read as follows: "The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon

as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States ; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess."

There were with these, men who acted from mere policy, thinking it best to admit the slave State because of the difficulty and also the danger to the Union of suppressing slavery there. They appealed as well to the sacred compromises in the constitution, meaning the permission at first to import slaves, the three-fifths rule for slave representation in Congress, and the fugitive slave clause. They spoke much of the necessity of preserving the balance of power within the Union, and of Congress's inaction as to slavery in the Louisiana purchase hitherto, and also in Florida. These arguments won many professed foes of slavery, as Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Quincy Adams. In all Congress Clay was the most earnest pleader for the compromise.

To all these arguments the unbending friends of free soil replied that property right was subordinate to the national good, and that Congress had full power over territorial institutions and should never have permitted slavery to curse the domain in question. If it had committed error in the past, that could not excuse continuance in error. The terms of the Louisiana purchase, it was further urged, could not, even if they had been meant to do so, which was not true, detract from this sovereign

power. It was pointed out that in every case in which a State had been admitted thus far, Congress had prescribed conditions. It was boldly said, still further, that if slavery threatened disunion unless allowed its way, it ought all the more to be denied its way.

The chief strength of slavery in this crisis lay in the distressing practical difficulty, if the prayer of Missouri were refused, of dealing with slaves and slave proprietorship there, and of quieting a numerous and spirited population bent upon statehood and slavery together. The more decided foes of slavery did not sufficiently consider these complications. Nor did they duly reflect upon the sweeping triumph which freedom had withal secured in the pledge that the vast bulk of the Louisiana purchase should be forever free. The pledge was indeed broken in 1854, but not until such a sense of its sacredness had been impressed upon the country that the breach availed slavery nothing.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE GREAT NULLIFICATION

THE tariff rates of 1816 on cottons and woollens were to be twenty-five per cent. for three years, after that twenty. Instead of this the cotton tariff was in 1824 replaced at twenty-five per cent., the same as that upon woollens costing thirty-three and a third cents or less per square yard; woollens over this price bearing thirty per cent. Wool, which by the tariff of 1816 was free, now bore, some grades fifteen, some twenty, some thirty per cent. Iron duties were put up in 1818 and again in 1824, from which date for ten years they ranged between forty and one hundred per cent. The whole tendency of tariff rates was strongly upward. The duty upon all dutiables averaged between 1816 and 1824 only twenty-four and a half per cent.; from 1824 to 1828 the average was thirty-two and a half per cent. Importation remained copious, notwithstanding, which made the cry for protection louder than ever.

From Quincy Adams's presidency the tariff question becomes on the one hand political, dividing Whigs from Democrats about exactly, which had never been the case before, and on the other, sectional, the West, the Centre, and now also the East,

pitted against the solid South, except Louisiana. The year 1824 heard Webster's last speech for free trade and saw Calhoun's and Jackson's last vote for protection. However, so strong was the protectionist sentiment in the XXth Congress, though democratic, that free-traders could hope to defeat the new tariff bill of 1828 only by rendering it odious to New England. They therefore conspired to make prohibitive its rates for Smyrna wool, and nearly so those on iron, hemp, and cordage for ship-building; also on molasses, the raw material for rum, whereon no drawback was longer to be allowed if it was exported.

The Whigs had arranged, to be now passed, a series of minimum rates on woollens, by which all costing over fifty cents a square yard were to pay as if costing \$2.50, and all over this as if costing \$4.00. The rate was to be forty per cent. the first year, forty-five the second, and fifty thereafter. This illustrates the famous "minimum principle," which has played such a figure in all our tariff history since 1816, its effect being always to make the tariff much higher than it seems. Thus in the case before us, most of the woollens then imported cost about ninety cents. If based on this price, the tariff would be 36 per cent., but if based on \$2.50 as the price, it would mount up to 110 per cent. To prevent this and to render the bill still more unpalatable to the Whigs, the Democrats introduced a dollar "minimum," so that the tariff on the bulk of our imported woollens, costing, as just stated, about ninety cents, would come in at forty-four and four-tenths per cent.

But as this was after all more vigorous protection than woollens had before received, amounting, through *minima*, in some cases to over 100 per cent., sixteen out of the thirty-nine New England members, led by Webster, accepted this universally odious tariff bill—the Tariff of Abominations, it was called—as the preferable evil, and, aided by a few Democrats in each house, made it a law. The average duty on dutiables was now about forty-three and a third per cent.

No one can question that this high tariff worked injustice to the South. It forced from her an undue share of the national taxes, as well as extensive tribute to northern manufacturers. But in resenting the evil she exaggerated it, mistakenly referring all the relative decrease in her prosperity to tariff legislation, when a great part of it was due simply to slavery. The South complained that selfishness and political ambition, not patriotism or reason, determined the dominant policy, and there was of course some truth in this. Moreover, as New England now favored it, this policy bade fair to become permanent, and since the tariff bills did not announce protection as their purpose, the constitutionality of them could not be gotten before the courts.

Nearly all the Southern Legislatures consequently denounced the tariff as unjust and as hostile to our fundamental law. Most of them were, however, prudent enough to suggest no illegal remedies. Not so with fiery South Carolina, where a large party, inspired by Calhoun, proposed a bold nullification of the tariff act, virtually amounting

to secession. At a dinner in this interest at Washington, April 13, 1830, Calhoun offered the toast: "The Union; *next* to our liberty the most dear; only to be preserved by respecting the rights of the States."

John C. Calhoun was now, except, perhaps, Clay, the ablest and most influential politician in all the South. Born in South Carolina in 1782, of Irish-Presbyterian parentage, though poor and in youth ill-educated like Clay and Jackson, his energy carried him through Yale College, and through a course of legal study at Litchfield, Conn., where stood the only law-school then in America. November, 1811, found him a member of Congress, on fire for war with Britain. Monroe's Secretary of War for seven years from 1817, he was in 1825 elected Vice-President, and re-elected in 1828. He had meantime turned an ardent free-trader, and seeing the North's predominance in the Union steadily increasing, had built up a nullification theory based upon that of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions and the Hartford Convention, and upon the history of the formation of our constitution. He had worked out to his own satisfaction the untenable view that each State had the right, not in the way of revolution but under the constitution itself—as a contract between parties that had no superior referee—to veto national laws upon its own judgment of their unconstitutionality.

On this doctrine South Carolina presently proceeded to act. November 24, 1832, the convention of that State passed its nullification ordinance, de-

claring the tariff acts of 1828 and 1832 "null, void, and no law," defying Congress to execute them there, and agreeing, upon the first use of force for this purpose, to form a separate government.

This was the quintessence of folly even had good theory been behind it. The tone of the proceeding was too hasty and peremptory. The decided turn of public opinion and of congressional action in favor of large reduction in duties was ignored. But the theory appealed to was clearly wrong, and along with its advocates was sure to be reprobated by the nation. A precious opportunity effectively to redress the evil complained of was wantonly thrown away. Worst of all, from a tactical point of view, South Carolina had miscalculated the spirit of President Jackson. At the dinner referred to, his toast had been the memorable words: "Our Federal Union; it must be preserved." Men now saw that Old Hickory was in earnest. General Scott, with troops and war ships, was ordered to Charleston.

The nullifiers receded, a course made easier by Clay's "compromise tariff" of 1833, gradually reducing duties for the next ten years, and enlarging the free list. From all duties of over twenty per cent. by the act of 1832, one-tenth of the excess was to be stricken off on September 30, 1835, and another tenth every other year till 1841. Then one half the excess remaining was to fall, and in 1842 the rest, so that the end of the last named year should find no duty over twenty per cent.

This episode, threatening as it was for a time,



drew in its train results the most happy, revealing with unprecedented vividness to most, both the original nature of the constitution as not a compact, and also the might which national sentiment had attained since the War of 1812. The doctrine of state rights was seen to have gradually lost, over the greater part of the country, all its old vitality. Nearly every State Legislature condemned the South Carolina pretensions, Democrats as hearty in this as Whigs. Jackson's proclamation against them—impressive and unanswerable—ran thus: "The constitution of the United States forms a government, not a league; and whether it be formed by compact between the States, or in any other manner, its character is the same. . . . I consider the power to annul a law of the United States incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the constitution, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed. . . . Our constitution does not contain the absurdity of giving power to make laws, and another power to resist them. To say that any State may at pleasure secede from the Union is to say that the United States are not a nation."

The congressional debates which the nullification question evoked, among the ablest in our parliamentary history, held the like high national tenor. Calhoun's idea, though advocated by him with consummate skill, was shown to be wholly chimerical. The doughty South Carolinian, from this moment a waning force in American politics, was supported by Hayne almost alone, the argu-

ments of both melting into air before Webster's masterful handling of constitutional history and law. Not questioning the right of revolution, admitting the general government to be one of "strictly limited," even of "enumerated, specified, and particularized powers," the Massachusetts orator made it convincingly apparent that the Calhoun programme could lead to nothing but anarchy. It was seen that general and state governments emanate from the people with equal immediacy, and that the language of the clause, "the Constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof" are "the supreme law of the land, *anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding,*" means precisely what it says. To this language little attention had apparently been paid till this time.

## CHAPTER V.

### MINOR PUBLIC QUESTIONS OF JACKSON'S "REIGN"

ANDREW JACKSON was born March 15, 1767. His parents had come from Carrickfergus, Ireland, two years before. He was without any education worthy the name. As a boy he went into the War for Independence, and was for a time a British prisoner. He studied law in North Carolina, moved west, and began legal practice at Nashville. He was one of the framers of the Tennessee constitution in 1796. In 1797 he was a senator from that State, and subsequently he was a judge on its supreme bench. His exploits in the Creek War, the War of 1812, and the Seminole War are already familiar. They had brought him so prominently and favorably before the country that in 1824 his vote, both popular and electoral, was larger than that of any other candidate. As we have seen, he himself and multitudes throughout the country thought him wronged by the election over him of John Quincy Adams. This contributed largely to his popularity later, and in 1828 he was elected by a popular vote of 647,231, against 509,097 for Adams. Four years later he was re-elected against Clay by a still larger majority. Nor did his popularity to any extent wane during

his double administration, notwithstanding his many violent and indiscreet acts as President.

Much of Jackson's arbitrariness sprung from a foolish whim of his, taking his election as equivalent to the enactment of all his peculiar ideas into law. Ours is a government of the people, he said; the people had spoken in his election, and had willed so and so. Woe to any senator or representative who opposed! This was, of course, to mistake entirely the nature of constitutional government.

After all, Jackson was by no means the ignorant and passionate old man, controlled in everything by Van Buren, that many people, especially in New England, have been accustomed to think him. Illiterate he certainly was, though Adams exaggerated in calling him "a barbarian who could not write a sentence of grammar and could hardly spell his own name." He was never popular in the federalist section of the Union. Yet with all his mistakes and self-will, often inexcusable, he was one of the most patriotic and clear-headed men who ever administered a government. If he resorted to unheard-of methods within the law, very careful was he never to transgress the law.

The most just criticism of Jackson in his time and later related to the civil service. It was during his administration that the cry, "turn the rascals out," first arose, and it is well known that, adopting the policy of New York and Pennsylvania politicians in vogue since 1800, he made nearly a clean sweep of his political opponents from the offices at his disposal. This was the

more shameful from being so in contrast with the policy of preceding presidents. Washington removed but two men from office, one of these a defaulter; Adams, ten, one of these also a defaulter; Jefferson but thirty-nine; Madison five, three of them defaulters; and Monroe nine. The younger Adams removed but two, both of them for cause.

Yet of Jackson's procedure in this matter it can be said, in partial excuse, so bitter had been the opposition to him by office-holders as well as others, that many removals were undoubtedly indispensable in order to the efficiency of the public service. It is not at all necessary for the rank and file of the civil service to be of the same party with the Chief Magistrate, but it is necessary that they should not be so utterly opposed to him as to feel bound in conscience to be working for his defeat.

The fine art of party organization, semi-military in form, has come to us from Jackson and his workers. Before his time, candidates for high state offices had usually been nominated by legislative caucuses, and those for national posts by congressional caucuses. State party conventions had been held in Pennsylvania and New York. Soon after 1830 such a device for national nominations began to be thought of, and the history of national party conventions may be said to begin with the campaign of 1832.

Jackson's dearest foe while in office was the United States Bank. Magnifying the dishonesty which had, as everyone knew, disgraced its management, he attacked it as a monster, an engine of the moneyed classes for grinding the face of the

poor. Like Jefferson, like Madison at first, he disbelieved in its constitutionality. In his first inaugural and continually in his official utterances he inveighed against it as a public danger, using its funds and patronage for party ends. This made him unpopular with many who had been his friends, so that in the campaign of 1832 Clay forced the bank question to the front as one on which Jackson's attitude would greatly advantage the whig cause. He accepted Clay's challenge with pleasure and from this moment gave the bank no quarter. We may call the contest of this year a pitched battle between Jackson and the bank.

In 1832 he vetoed a bill for a renewal of its charter, which was to expire in 1836, and in 1833 he proceeded to break it by removing the United States deposits which it held. Such removal was by law within the power of the Secretary of the Treasury. Secretary McLane refused to execute Jackson's will. He was removed and Duane appointed. Then Duane was removed and Roger B. Taney appointed, who obeyed the President's behest. The bank was emptied by checking out the public money as wanted, at the same time depositing no more, the funds being instead placed in "pet" state banks, as they were called because of the government favor thus shown them.

The financial distress rightly or wrongly ascribed to this measure throughout the country, instead of injuring Jackson, probably, on the whole, made him still more popular, as showing the power of the bank. When Congress met in 1833, the Senate passed a vote of censure upon him for what

he had done. Rancorous wranglings and debates pervaded Congress and the whole land. After persistent effort by Jackson's bosom friend, Senator Benton, of Missouri, this censure-vote was expunged by the XXXIVth Congress, second session, January 16, 1837. This was before Jackson left office, and he accounted it the greatest triumph of his public life.

Jackson was somehow fortunate in dealing with foreign nations. It was he who recovered for American ships that British West Indian trade which had been so long denied. Negotiations were opened with Great Britain, which, in 1830, had the result of placing American vessels in the British West Indian ports at an equal advantage with British vessels sailing thither from the United States—terms which, through the contiguity of those islands to us, gave us a trade there better than that of any other nation. This diplomacy brought the administration much applause.

When Jackson became President, France was still in our debt on account of her spoliations upon American commerce after the settlement of 1803. The matter had been in negotiation ever since 1815, but hitherto in vain. Jackson took it up with zeal, but with his usual apparent recklessness. A treaty had been concluded in 1831, as a final settlement between the two countries, binding France to pay twenty-five million francs and the United States to pay one and one-half million. The first instalment from France became due February 2, 1833, but was not paid. Jackson's message to Congress in 1834, not an instalment having yet been received, con-

tained a distinct threat of war should not payment begin forthwith. He also bade Edward Livingston, minister at Paris, in the same contingency to demand his passports and leave Paris for London.

Most public men, even those in his cabinet, thought this action foolhardy and useless; but Quincy Adams, neither expecting nor receiving any thanks for it, just as in the Seminole War difficulty, nobly stood up for the President. A telling speech by him in the House led to its unanimous resolution, March 2, 1835, that the execution of the treaty should be insisted on. The French ministry blustered, and for a time diplomatic relations between the two countries were entirely ruptured. But France, affecting to see in the message of 1835, though voiced in precisely the same tone as its predecessor, some apology for the menace contained in that, began its payments. This money, as also all due from the other states included in Napoleon's continental system, was paid during Jackson's administration, a result which brought him and his party great praise, not more for the money than for the respect and consideration secured to the United States by insistence upon its rights. The President's message to Congress in 1835 announced the entire extinguishment of the public debt—the first and the last time this has occurred in all our national history.

An important measure touching the hard-money system of our country was passed in large part through the influence of President Jackson. By the Mint Law of 1792 our silver dollar was made to contain three hundred and seventy-one and a



quarter grains of fine silver, or four hundred and sixteen of standard silver. The amount of pure silver in this venerable coin has remained unchanged ever since; only, in 1837, by a reduction of the alloy fraction to exactly one-tenth, the total weight of the coin became what it now is, four hundred and twelve and a half grains, nine-tenths fine. The same law of 1892 had given the gold dollar just one-fifteenth the weight of the silver dollar. This proportion, which Hamilton had arrived at after careful investigation characteristic of the man, was exactly correct at the time, but within a year, as is now known, on account of increase in the relative value of gold, the gold dollar at fifteen to one became more valuable than its silver mate. The consequence was that the gold brought to the United States mint for coinage fell off year by year, until some of the years between 1820 and 1830 it had been almost zero. Gold money had nearly ceased to circulate.

Jackson resolved to restore the yellow metal to daily use. In this he was opposed by many Whigs, who, so zealous were they for the United States Bank, had become paper money men. The so-called Gold Bill was carried through Congress in 1834, changing the proportion of silver to gold in our currency from fifteen to one to sixteen to one. It should have been fifteen and a half to one. Now gold in its turn was over-valued, so that silver gradually ceased to circulate, as gold had almost ceased before. This result was made worse after 1848, when there was a still further appreciation of silver through the discovery of gold in California

and Australia. Silver dollars did not again circulate freely in the country until 1878, though they were full legal tender till 1873. Gold, on the other hand, was everywhere seen after 1834, though not abundant in circulation, owing to the large amounts of paper money then in use.

In 1836 the President ordered his Secretary of the Treasury to put forth the famous Specie Circular, declaring that only gold, silver, or land scrip should be received in payment for public lands. The occasion of this was that while land sales were very rapidly increasing, the receipts hitherto had consisted largely in the notes of insolvent banks. Land speculators would organize a bank, procure for it, if they could, the favor of being a "pet" bank, issue notes, borrow these as individuals and buy land with them. The notes were deposited, when they would borrow them again to buy land with, and so on. As there was little specie in the West, the circular broke up many a fine plan, and evoked much ill-feeling. Gold was drawn from the East, where, as many of the banks had none too much, the drain caused not a few of them to collapse. The condition of business at this time was generally unsound, and this westward movement of gold was all that was needed to precipitate a crisis. A crisis accordingly came on soon after, painfully severe. It is unfair, however, to arraign Jackson's order as wholly responsible for the evils which accompanied this monetary cataclysm. It was rather an occasion than the cause.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE FIRST WHIG TRIUMPH

PARTLY Jackson's personal influence, partly his able aides, partly favoring circumstances had, during his administrations, brought the Democracy into excellent condition, patriotic, national in general spirit, with a creed that, however imperfect—close construction being its integrating idea—was, after all, definite, consistent, and thoughtful. Yet in 1840 the Democrats, who four years before had chosen Van Buren by an electoral vote of 170 to seventy-three, had to surrender, with the same Van Buren for candidate, to the Whigs by a majority of 234 electoral votes to sixty, only five States, and but two of them northern, going for the democratic candidate.

There were several causes for this defeat. Jackson had made many enemies as well as many friends, some of these within his own party, while the entire opposition to him was indescribably bitter on account of the personal element entering into the struggle. The commendably national spirit of the Whig Party told well in its favor. Upon this point its attitude proved far more in accord with the best sentiment of the nation than that of the Democracy, sound as the latter was. at

the core and nobly as its chief had behaved in the nullification crisis.

More influential still was the financial predicament into which on Jackson's retirement his successor and the country were plunged. The commercial distress which seemed to spring from Jackson's measures was now first fully realized. Anger and pain from the death of the bank had not abated. Ardent hatred prevailed toward the "pet" banks, extending to the party whose darlings they were, while the Specie Circular was held to have ruined most of the others. The subsequent legislation for distributing the treasury surplus among the States, by removing the deposits from the pet banks destroyed many of these as well. They had been using this government money for the discount of loans to business men, and were not in condition instantly to pay it back. Hence the panic of 1837. First the New York City banks suspended, soon followed by the others throughout that State, all sustained in their course by an act of the Legislature. Suspension presently occurred everywhere else. The financial pressure continued through the entire summer of 1837, banks, corporations, and business men going to the wall, and all values greatly sinking. Boston suffered one hundred and sixty-eight business failures in six months.

One of Van Buren's earliest acts after assuming office was to call an extra session of Congress for September 4, 1837, to consider the financial condition of the country. When it convened, an increase of the whig vote was apparent, though the

Democrats were still in the majority. On the President's recommendation, agitation now began in favor of the sub-treasury or independent treasury plan, still in use to-day, of keeping the government moneys. This had been first broached in 1834-35 by Whigs. The Democrats then opposed it; but now they took it up as a means of counteracting the whig purpose to revive a national bank.

There was soon less need of any such special arrangement, as the treasury was swiftly running dry. In June of the preceding year, 1836, both parties concurring, an act had passed providing that after January 1, 1837, all surplus revenue should be distributed to the States in proportion to their electoral votes. It was meant to be a loan, to be recalled, however, only by vote of Congress, but it proved a donation. Twenty-eight millions were thus paid in all, never to return. Such a disposition of the revenue had now to be stopped and reverse action instituted. Importers called for time on their revenue bonds, which had to be allowed, and this checked income. This special session was needed to authorize an issue of ten million in treasury notes to tide the Government over the crisis.

Another influence which now worked powerfully against the Democracy was hostility to slavery. This campaign—it was the first—saw a "Liberty Party" in the field, with its own candidates, Birney and Lemoyne. The abolition sentiment, of which more will be said in a subsequent chapter, was growing day by day, and little as the Whigs could be called an anti-slavery party on the whole,

their rank and file were very much more of that mind than those of the opposition. Jackson had ranted wildly against the dispatch of abolition literature through the mails. The second Seminole War, 1835-42, was waged mainly in deference to slave-holders, to recover for them their Florida runaways, and, by removal of the Seminoles beyond the Mississippi, to break up a popular resort for escaped negroes. The Indians, under Osceola, whose wife, as daughter to a slave-mother, had been treacherously carried back into bondage, fought like tigers. After their massacre of Major Dade and his detachment, Generals Gaines, Jesup, Taylor, Armistead, and Worth successively marched against them, none but the last-named successful in subduing them. Over 500 persons had been restored to slavery, each one costing the Government, as was estimated, at least \$80,000 and the lives of three white soldiers.

Van Buren was to the slavocrats even more obsequious than Jackson. His spirit was shown, among other things, by the *Amistad* case, in 1839. The schooner *Amistad* was sailing between Havana and Puerto Principe with a cargo of negroes kidnapped in Africa. Under the lead of a bright negro named Cinque the captives revolted and killed or confined all the crew but two, whom they commanded to steer the ship for Africa. Instead, these directed her to the United States coast, where she was seized off Long Island by a war vessel and brought into New London. The negroes were, even by Spanish law, not slaves but free men, as Spain had prohibited the slave trade.

Yet when their case was tried before the district court, Mr. Van Buren spared no effort to procure their release to the Spanish claimants. He even had a government vessel all ready to convey the poor victims back to Cuba. The district court having decided for the blacks, the government attorney appealed to the circuit court, thence also to the supreme court. Final judgment happily re-affirmed that the men were free. The supreme court trial was the occasion of one of John Quincy Adams's most splendid forensic victories, he being the counsel for the negroes.

The attitude of the administration in this affair greatly injured the party in the North, the more as it but illustrated a spirit and policy which had grown characteristic of the party's head. In several instances previous to this time, when ships conveying slaves from one of the United States to another, entered the ports of the Bahama Islands through stress of weather, England had, while freeing them, allowed some compensation. Now, having emancipated the slaves in her own West Indian possessions, she declined longer to continue that practice. Her first refusal touched the slaves on the ship *Enterprise*, which had put in at Port Hamilton in 1835. Jackson's administration in vain sought indemnity, Van Buren, then Secretary of State, designating this business as "the most immediately pressing" before the English embassy.

In the same pro-slavery interest an increasing proportion of the Democracy, though not Van Buren himself, had come to favor the annexation of Texas. The southwestern boundary of the United

States had ever since the purchase of Florida in 1819 been recognized as the Sabine River, west of this lying the then foreign country of Texas. France had claimed the Rio Grande as Louisiana's western bound, but Mr. Monroe, to placate the North in the Florida annexation, had receded from this claim. Texas and Coahuila became a state in the new Mexican republic, which Spain recognized in 1821 ; but in 1836 Texas declared itself independent. It was ill-governed and weighed down with debt, and hence almost immediately, in 1837, asked membership in the American Union. Its annexation was bitterly opposed all over the North, so bitterly in fact that the northern Democrats would not have dared, even had they wished, to favor the scheme. Yet so strong was the southern influence in the party by 1840 that the democratic platform that year urged the "re-annexation" of Texas, the term assuming that as a part of Louisiana it had always been ours since 1803. This was a fact, but it was now asseverated by the Democracy for a selfish sectional purpose, and the cry brought thousands of votes to the Whigs.

It proved good politics for the Whigs in 1840 to pass over Clay and adopt as their candidate William Henry Harrison. He had indeed been unsuccessful in 1836, owing to the great popularity of Jackson, all whose influence went for Van Buren ; but now that "Little Van," or "Matty," as Jackson used to call him, stood alone, Harrison had a better chance. His political record had been inconspicuous but honorable. Nothing could be alleged against his character. He was a gentleman



of some ability, while his brilliant military record in 1812, now revived to the minutest detail, gave him immense popularity. Every surviving Tippecanoe or Thames veteran stumped his vicinity for the old war-horse. Many wavering Democrats in the South, especially those of the nullification stripe, were toled to the whig ticket by the nomination of John Tyler for Vice-President. "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" rang through the land as the whig watchword for the campaign. During the electioneering every hamlet was regaled with portrayals of Harrison's simple farm life at North Bend, where, a log cabin his dwelling, and hard cider—so one would have supposed—his sole beverage, he had been a genuine Cincinnatus. "Tippecanoe and Tyler" were therefore elected; their popular vote numbering 1,275,017, against 1,128,702 polled for Van Buren.

However, this whig success, for a moment so imposing, proved superficial and brief. Harrison died at the end of his first month in office, and Tyler, coming in, showed that though training under the whig banner, he had not renounced a single one of his democratic principles. The Whigs scorned and soon officially repudiated him. During the entire four years that he held office there was constant deadlock between him and the slight whig majority in Congress, which gave the Democrats main control in legislation. The panic of 1837 was forgotten, while the hold of the Democracy upon the country was so firm that its gains in Congress and its triumphs in the States once more went steadily on.

## CHAPTER VII.

### LIFE AND MANNERS IN THE FOURTH DECADE

By the census of 1830 the United States had a population of 12,866,020, the increase having been for the preceding ten years about sufficient to double the inhabitants in thirty years. There were twenty-four States, Indiana having been taken into the Union in 1816, Mississippi in 1817, Illinois in 1818, Alabama in 1819, Maine in 1820, and Missouri, the last, in 1821. Florida, Michigan, and Arkansas were the Territories. The area, now that Florida had been annexed, was 725,406 square miles.

Comparatively little of the soil of Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin had as yet been occupied, though settlements were making on most of the larger streams. The Southwest had at this time filled up more rapidly than the Northwest. In 1830 the centre of population for the Union was farther south than it has ever been at any other time. Except in Louisiana and Missouri, not over thirty thousand inhabitants were to be found west of the Mississippi. The vast outer ranges of the Louisiana purchase remained a mysterious wilderness. Indianapolis in 1827 contained twenty-five brick houses, sixty frame, and

about eighty log houses ; also a court-house, a jail, and three churches. Chicago was laid out in 1830. Thither in 1834 went one mail per week, from Niles, Mich., on horseback. In 1833 it was incorporated as a town, having 175 houses and 550 inhabitants. That year it began publishing a newspaper and organized two churches. In 1837 it was a city, with 4,170 inhabitants. The Territory of Iowa had in 1836, 10,500 inhabitants ; in 1840, 43,000. At this time Wisconsin had 31,000. So early as 1835 Ohio had nearly or quite one million inhabitants. Sixty-five of its towns had together 125 newspapers. Between 1830 and 1840 Ohio's population rose from 900,000 to 1,500,000 ; Michigan's from 30,000 to 212,000 ; and the whole country's from thirteen to seventeen millions. Before 1840, eight steamers connected Chicago with Buffalo.

By 1840 nearly all the land of the United States this side the Mississippi had been taken up by settlers. The last districts to be occupied were Northern Maine, the Adirondack region of New York, a strip in Western Virginia from the Potomac southward through Kentucky nearly to the Tennessee line, the Pine Barrens of Georgia, and the extremities of Michigan and Wisconsin. Beyond the Father of Waters his shores were mostly occupied, as well as those of his main tributaries, a good way from their mouths. The Missouri Valley had population as far as Kansas City. Arkansas, Missouri, and Iowa Territory had many settlements at some distance from the streams. The aggregate population of the country was 17,-

069,453, the average density twenty-one and a tenth to the square mile. The mass of westward immigration was as yet native, since the great rush from Europe only began about 1847. This was fortunate, as fixing forever the American stamp upon the institutions of western States. To compensate each new commonwealth for the non-taxation of the United States land it contained, it received one township in each thirty-six as its own for educational purposes, a provision to which is due the magnificent school system of Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and their younger sisters.

Farther east, too, there had, of course, been growth, but it was slower. In 1827 Hartford had but 6,900 inhabitants; New Haven, 7,100; Newark, N. J., 6,500, and New Brunswick about the same. The State of New York paid out, between 1815 and 1825, nearly \$90,000 for the destruction of wolves, showing that its rural population had attained little density. The entire country had vastly improved in all the elements of civilization. A national literature had sprung up, crowding out the reprints of foreign works which had previously ruled the market. Bryant, Cooper, Dana, Drake, Halleck, and Irving were now re-enforced by writers like Bancroft, Emerson, Hawthorne, Holmes, Longfellow, Poe, Prescott, and Whittier. Educational institutions were multiplied and their methods bettered. The number of newspapers had become enormous. Several religious journals were established previous to 1830, among them the *New York Observer*, which dates from 1820,

and the *Christian Register*, from 1821. Steam printing had been introduced in 1823. The year 1825 saw the first Sunday paper; it was the *New York Sunday Courier*. Greeley began his *New York Tribune* only in 1841.

Fresh news had begun to be prized, as shown by the competition between the two great New York sheets, the *Journal of Commerce* and the *Morning Enquirer*, each of which, in 1827, established for this purpose swift schooner lines and pony expresses. The *Journal of Commerce* in 1833 put on a horse express between Philadelphia and New York, with relays of horses, enabling it to publish congressional news a day earlier than any of its New York contemporaries. Other papers soon imitated this example, whereupon the *Journal* extended its relays to Washington. Mails came to be more numerous and prompt. More letters were written, and, from 1839, letters were sent in envelopes. Postage-stamps were not used till 1847. Most of the principal cities in the country, including Rochester and Cincinnati, published dailies before 1830. Baltimore and Louisville had each a public school in 1829. This year witnessed in Boston the beginning work of the first blind asylum in the country. In Hartford instruction had already been given to the deaf and dumb since 1817.

By the fourth decade of the century the American character had assumed a good deal of definiteness and greatly interested foreign travellers. There was, by those who knew what foreign manners were, much foolish aping of the same. Eng-

lish visitors noted Brother Jonathan's drawl in talking, his phlegmatic temperament, keen eye, and blistering inquisitiveness. Jonathan was a rover and a trader, everywhere at home, everywhere bent upon the main chance. He ate too rapidly, chewed and smoked tobacco, and spat indecently. He drank too much. During the first quarter of the century nearly everyone used liquor, and drunkenness was shamefully common. Every public entertainment, even if religious, set out provision of free punch. At hotels, brandy was placed upon the table, free as water to all. The smaller sects often held preaching services in bar-rooms for lack of better accommodations. On such occasions the preacher was not infrequently observed, without affront to anyone, to refresh himself from behind the bar just before announcing his text.

In 1824 commenced in Boston a temperance movement which accomplished in this matter the most happy reform. It swept New England, passing thence to all the other parts of the Union. By the end of 1829 over a thousand temperance societies were in existence. The distilling and importation of spirits fell off immensely. It became fashionable not to drink, and little by little drinking came to be stigmatized as immoral.

By the time of which we now speak, the old habit of expressing solicitude for the fate of the Union had passed away. Whig like Democrat—so different from old Federalist—swore by "the people." Every American believed in America. Traveling abroad, the man from this country was wont to assume, and if opposed to contend, ill-mau-

neredly sometimes, that its institutions were far the best in the world. No one wished a change. The unparalleled prosperity of all contributed to this satisfaction. Cities and towns came up in a day. Public improvements were to be seen making in every direction. There was no idle aristocracy on the one hand, no beggars on the other. Self-respect was universal. The people held the power. If men attained great wealth, as not a few did, they usually did not waste it but invested it. Business enterprise was intense and common. Character entered into credit as an element along with financial resources. People did not crowd into cities, but loved and built up the country rather. Laws and penalties were become more mild. In 1837 a man was flogged at the whipping-post in Providence, R. I., for horse-stealing, perhaps the last case of the kind in the country. Prisons were now made clean and healthy, and the idea of reforming the criminal instead of taking vengeance upon him was spreading. Reformatories for children had been opened in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. There were institutions for homeless children, for the sick poor, for the insane, and for other unfortunate classes.

By this time the Methodists and Baptists had become extremely strong in numbers. In 1833 the Massachusetts constitution was altered, abolishing obligatory contributions for the support of the ministry of the standing order. Connecticut had made the same change fifteen years before, in its constitution of 1818. In many localities the newer denominations, hitherto sects, were more influen-

tial than the old one, and in this abolition of ecclesiastical taxes they had with them Jews, atheists, deists, agnostics, and heathen.

About 1825 began a period of peculiar religious enthusiasm. Missions to the heathen were instituted. Revivals were numerous and often shook whole neighborhoods for weeks and months. About this date Millerism began to make converts. William Miller, from whom it took its name, preached far and wide that the world would be destroyed in 1843, securing multitudes of disciples, who clung to his general belief even after his prophecy as to the specific date for the final catastrophe was seen to have failed. Mormonism was also founded in 1830, and the Book of Mormon published by Joseph Smith. A church of this order, organized this year at Manchester, N. Y., removed the next to Kirtland, O., and thence to Independence, Mo. Driven from here by mob violence, they built the town of Nauvoo, Ill. Meeting in this place too with what they regarded persecution, several of their members being prosecuted for polygamy, they were obliged to migrate to Salt Lake City, where, however they were not fully settled until 1848.

As part of the same general stir we may perhaps register the Anti-Masonic movement. One William Morgan, a Mason residing in Western New York, was reported about to expose in a publication the secrets of that order. The Masons were desirous of preventing this and made several forcible efforts to that end. Morgan was soon missing, and the exciting assumption was almost univer-



sally made that the Masons had taken him off. There was much evidence of this ; but conviction was found impossible because, as was alleged, judges, juries, and witnesses were nearly all Masons. An intense and wide-spread feeling was developed that Masonry held itself superior to the laws, was therefore a foe to the Government and must be destroyed. The Anti-Masons became a mighty political party. Masons were driven from office. In 1832 anti-masonic nominations were made for President and Vice-president, which had much to do with the small vote of Clay in that year. It was this party that brought to the front politically William H. Seward, Millard Fillmore, and Thurlow Weed.

In 1833 Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania passed laws suppressing lotteries, but the gambling mania seemed to transform itself into a craze for banks. In many parts this was such that actual riots took place when subscriptions to the stock of banks were opened, the earliest comers subscribing the whole with the purpose of selling to others at an advance. To make a bank was thought the great panacea for every ill that could befall. In this we see that the American people, bright as they were, could be duped.

Less wonder, then, at the success of the Moon Hoax, perpetrated in 1835. It was generally known that Sir John Herschel had gone to the Cape of Good Hope to erect an observatory. One day the New York *Sun* came out with what purported to be part of a supplement to the *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, giving an account of Herschel's remarkable

discoveries. The moon, so the bogus relation ran, had been found to be inhabited by human beings with wings. Herschel had seen flocks of them flying about. Their houses were triangular in form. The telescope had also revealed beavers in the moon, exhibiting most remarkable intelligence. Pictures of some of these and of moon scenery accompanied the article. The fraud was so clever as to deceive learned and unlearned alike. The sham story was continued through several issues of the *Sun*, and gave the paper an enormous sale. As it arrived in the different places, crowds scrambled for it, nor would those who failed to secure copies disperse until some one more fortunate had read to them all that the paper said upon the subject. Several colleges sent professorial deputations to the *Sun* office to see the article, and particularly the appendices, which, it was alleged, had been kept back. Richard Adams Locke was the author of this ingenious deception, which was not exploded until the arrival of authentic intelligence from Edinburgh.

Party spirit sometimes ran terribly high. A New York City election in 1834 was the occasion of a riot between men of the two parties, disturbances continuing several days. Political meetings were broken up and the militia had to be called out to enforce order. Citizens armed themselves, fearing attacks upon banks and business houses. When it was found that the Whigs were triumphant in the city, deafening salutes were fired. Philadelphia Whigs celebrated this victory with a grand barbecue, attended, it was estimated, by fifty thousand

people. The death of Harrison was malignantly ascribed to over-eating in Washington, after his long experience with insufficient diet in the West. Whigs exulted over Jackson's cabinet difficulties. Jackson's "Kitchen Cabinet," the power behind the throne, gave umbrage to his official advisers. Duff Green, editor of the *United States Telegraph*, the President's "organ," was one member; Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire, and Amos Kendall, first of Massachusetts, then of Kentucky, were others, these three the most influential. All had long worked, written, and cheered for Old Hickory. In return he gave them good places at Washington, and now they enjoyed dropping in at the White House to take a smoke with the grizzly hero and help him curse the opposition as foes of "the people."

Major Eaton, Old Hickory's first Secretary of War, had married a beautiful widow, maiden name Peggy O'Neil, of common birth, and much gossiped about. The female members of other cabinet families refused to associate with her, the Vice-President's wife leading. Jackson took up Mrs. Eaton's cause with all knightly zeal. He berated her traducers and persecutors in long and fierce personal letters. His niece and house-keeper, Mrs. Donelson, one of the anti-Eatonites, he turned out of the White House, with her husband, his private secretary. The breach was serious anyway, and might have been far more so but for the healing offices of Van Buren, who used all his courtliness and power of place to help the President bring about the social recognition of

Mrs. Eaton. He called upon her, made parties in her honor, and secured her *entrée* to the families of the greatest foreign ministers. Mrs. Eaton triumphed, but the scandal would not down.

When Jackson wrote his foreign message upon the French spoliation claims, his cabinet were aghast and begged him to soften its tone. Upon his refusal, it is said, they stole to the printing-office and did it themselves. But the proofs came back for Jackson's perusal. The lad who brought them was the late Mr. J. S. Ham, of Providence, R. I. He used to say that he had never known what profane swearing was till he listened to General Jackson's comments as those proofs were read.

Jackson and Quincy Adams were personal as well as political foes. When the President visited Boston, Harvard College bestowed on him the degree of Doctor of Laws. Adams, one of the overseers, opposed this with all his might. As "an affectionate child of our Alma Mater, he would not be present to witness her disgrace in conferring her highest literary honors upon a barbarian." Subsequently he would refer, with a sneer, to "Dr. Andrew Jackson." The President's illness at Boston Adams declared "four-fifths trickery" and the rest mere fatigue. He was like John Randolph, said Adams, who for forty years was always dying. "He is now alternately giving out his chronic diarrhoea and making Warren bleed him for a pleurisy, and posting to Cambridge for a doctorate of laws, mounting the monument of Bunker's Hill to hear a fulsome address and receive two cannon-balls from Edward Everett."

To be sure, manifestations of a contrary spirit between the political parties were not wanting. The entire nation mourned for Madison after his death in 1836, as it had on the decease of Jefferson and John Adams, both on the same day, July 4, 1826.

A note or two upon costume may not uninterestingly close this chapter.

Enormous bonnets were fashionable about 1830. Ladies also wore Leghorn hats, with very broad brims rolled up behind, tricked out profusely with ribbons and artificial flowers. Dress-waists were short and high. Skirts were short, too, hardly reaching the ankles. Sleeves were of the leg-of-mutton fashion, very full above the elbows but tightening toward the wrist. Gentlemen still dressed for the street not so differently from the revolutionary style. Walking-coats were of broad-cloth, blue, brown, or green, to suit the taste, with gilt buttons. Bottle-green was a very stylish color for evening coats. Blue and the gilt buttons for street wear were, however, beginning to be discarded, Daniel Webster being one of the last to walk abroad in them. The buff waistcoat, white cambric cravat, and ruffled shirt still held their own. Collars for full dress were worn high, covering half the cheek, a fashion which persisted in parts of the country till 1850 or later.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### INDUSTRIAL ADVANCE BY 1840

DURING the War of 1812 we had in England an industrial spy, whose campaign there has perhaps accomplished more for the country than all our armies did. It was Francis C. Lowell, of Boston. Great Britain was just introducing the power-loom. The secret of structure was guarded with all vigilance, yet Lowell, passing from cotton factory to cotton factory with Yankee eyes, ears, and wit, came home in 1814, believing, with good reason, as it proved, that he could set up one of the machines on American soil. Broad Street in Boston was the scene of his initial experiments, but the factory to the building of which they led was at Waltham. It was owned by a company, one of whose members was Nathan Appleton. Water furnished the motive power. By the autumn of 1814 Lowell had perfected his looms and placed them in the factory. Spinning machinery was also built, mounting seventeen hundred spindles. English cotton-workers did not as yet spin and weave under the same roof, so that the Lowell Mill at Waltham may, with great probability, be pronounced the first in the world to carry cloth manufacture harmoniously through all its several

successive steps from the raw stuff to the finished ware.

From this earliest establishment of the power-loom here, the cotton-cloth business strode rapidly forward. Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, and scores of other thriving towns sprung into being. Every year new mills were built. In 1831 there were 801; in 1840, 1,240; in 1850, 1,074. Henceforth, through consolidation, the number of factories decreased, but the number of spindles grew steadily larger. This rise of great manufacturing concerns was facilitated by a new order of corporation laws. There had been corporations in the country before 1830, as the Waltham case shows; but the system had had little evolution, as incorporation had in each case to proceed from a special legislative act. In 1837 Connecticut passed a statute making this unnecessary and enabling a group of persons to become a corporation on complying with certain simple requirements. New York placed a similar provision in its constitution of 1846. The Dartmouth College decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1819, interpreting an act of incorporation as a contract, which, by the Constitution, no State can violate, still further humored and aided the corporation system.

In 1816 the streets of Baltimore were lighted with gas. A gas-light company was incorporated in New York in 1823. Not till 1836, however, did the Philadelphia streets have gas lights. The first savings-banks were established in Philadelphia and Boston in 1816. Baltimore had one two

years later. Portable fire-proof safes were used in 1820. The Lehigh coal trade flourished this year, and also the manufacture of iron with coal. The whale fishery, too, was now beginning. The first factory in Lowell started in 1821. In 1822 there was a copper rolling mill in Baltimore, the only one then in America, and Paterson, N. J., began the manufacture of cotton duck. Patent leather was made in the United States by 1819. In 1824 Amesbury, Mass., had a water-power manufactory of flannel. The next year the practice of homœopathy began in America, and matches of a rude sort were displacing the old tinder-box. The next year after this Hartford produced axes and other edged tools. Lithography, of which there had been specimens so early as 1818, was a Boston business in 1827. Pittsburgh manufactured damask table linen in 1828. The same year saw paper made from straw, and planing machinery in operation. The insuring of lives began in this country in 1812.

The first figured muslin woven by the powerloom in America, and perhaps in the world, was produced at Central Falls, R. I., in 1829. Calico printing began at Lowell the same year, also the manufacture of cutlery at Worcester, of sewing-silk at Mansfield, Conn., of galvanized iron in New York City. With the new decade chloroform was invented, in 1831, being first used as a medicine, not as an anæsthetic. Reaping machines were on trial the same year, and three years later machine-made wood screws were turned out at Providence. About the same time, 1832, pins were



made by machinery, hosiery was woven by a power-loom process, and Colt perfected his revolver. In 1837 brass clocks were put upon the American market, and by 1840 extensively exported. Also in 1837 Nashua was making machinists' tools. By 1839 the manufacture of iron with hard coal was a pronounced success. In 1840 daguerreotypes began to appear. Steam fire-engines were seen the next year.

So early as 1816 the New York and Philadelphia stages made the distance from city to city between sun and sun. The National Road from Cumberland was finished to Wheeling in 1820, having been fourteen years in construction and costing \$17,000,000. It was subsequently extended westward across Ohio and Indiana. It was thirty-five feet wide, thoroughly macadamized, and had no grade of above five degrees. Over parts of this road no less than 150 six-horse teams passed daily, besides four or five four-horse mail and passenger coaches. In Jackson's time, when for some months there was talk of war with France and extra measures were thought proper for assuring the loyalty of Louisiana, swift mail connections were made with the Mississippi by the National Road. Its entire length was laid out into sections of sixty-three miles a-piece, each with three boys and nine horses, only six hours and eighteen minutes being allowed for traversing a section, viz., a rate of about ten miles an hour. Great men and even presidents travelled by the public coaches of this road, though many of them used their own carriages. James K. Polk

often made the journey from Nashville to Washington in his private carriage. Keeping down the Cumberland River to the Ohio, and up this to Wheeling, he would strike into the National Road eastward to Cumberland, Md. He came thus so late as 1845, to be inaugurated as President; only at this time he used the new railway from Cumberland to the Relay House, where he changed to the other new railway which had already joined Baltimore with Washington.

The first omnibus made its appearance in New York in 1830, the name itself originating from the word painted upon this vehicle. The first street railway was laid two years later. The era of the stage coach was at this time beginning to end, that of canals and railroads opening. Yet in the remoter sections of the country the old coach was destined to hold its place for decades still. Where roads were fair it would not uncommonly make one hundred miles between early morning and late evening, as between Boston and Springfield, Springfield and Albany. So soon as available the canal packet was a much more easy and elegant means of travel. The Erie Canal was begun in 1817, finished to Rochester in 1823, the first boat arriving October 8th. The year 1825 carried it to Buffalo. The Blackstone Canal, between Worcester and Providence, was opened its whole length in 1828; the next year many others, as the Chesapeake and Delaware, the Cumberland and Oxford in Maine, the Farmington in Connecticut, the Oswego, connecting the Erie Canal with Lake Ontario, also the Delaware and Hudson, one hun-

dred and eight miles long, from Honesdale, Pa., to Hudson River. The Welland Canal was completed in 1830.

Salt-water transportation had meantime been much facilitated by the use of steam. It had been thought a great achievement when, in 1817, the Black Ball line of packet ships between New York and Liverpool was regularly established, consisting of four vessels of from four hundred to five hundred tons apiece. But two years later a steamship crossed the Atlantic to Liverpool from Savannah. It took her twenty-five days—longer than the time in which the distance often used to be accomplished under sail. In 1822 there was a regular steamboat between Norfolk and New York, though no steamboat was owned in Boston till 1828. The Atlantic was first crossed exclusively by steam-power in 1838, and the first successful propeller used in 1839. The last-named year also witnessed the beginning of a permanent express line between Boston and New York, by the Stonington route. The next year, the Adams Express Company was founded, doing its first business between these two cities over the Springfield route, in competition with that by the Stonington.

But all these improvements were soon to be overshadowed by the work of the railway and locomotive. The first road of rails in America was in the Lehigh coal district of Pennsylvania. Its date is uncertain, but not later than 1825. In 1826, October 7th, the second began operation, at Quincy, Mass., transporting granite from the quarries to tide-water, about three miles. This

experiment attracted great attention, showing how much heavier loads could be transported over rails than upon common roads, and with how much greater ease and less expense ordinary weights could be carried. The same had been demonstrated in England before. Locomotives were not yet used in either country, but only horse-power. The conviction spread rapidly that not only highway transportation but even that by canals would soon be, for all large burdens, either quite superseded or of secondary importance. In 1827 the Maryland Legislature chartered a railroad from Baltimore to Wheeling. The projectors, though regarding it a bold act, promised an average rate between the two cities of at least four miles per hour. Subscriptions were offered for more than twice the amount of the stock. The Massachusetts Legislature the same year appointed commissioners to look out a railway route between Boston and Hudson River. Also in this year a railway was completed at Mauch Chunk, Pa., for transporting coal to the landing on the Lehigh. The descent was by gravity, mules being used to haul back the cars.

In most country parts, the new railway projects encountered great hostility. Engineers were not infrequently clubbed from the fields as they sought to survey. Learned articles appeared in the papers arguing against the need of railways and exhibiting the perils attending them. When steam came to be used, these scruples were re-enforced by the alleged danger that the new system of travel would do away with the market for

oats and for horses, and that stage-drivers would seek wages in vain.

The first trip by a locomotive was in 1828, over the Carbondale and Honesdale route in Pennsylvania. The engine was of English make, and run by Mr. Horatio Allen, who had had it built. This was a year before the first steam railroad was opened in England. July 4, 1828, construction upon the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was begun. It, like the other early roads, was built of stone cross-ties, with wooden rails topped with heavy straps of iron. Such ties were soon replaced by wooden ones, as less likely to be split by frost, but the wooden rail with its iron strap might be seen on branch lines, for instance, between Monocacy Bridge and Frederick City, Md., so late as the Civil War.

The first railroad for passengers in this country went into operation between Charleston and Hamburg, S. C., in 1830. The locomotive had been gotten up in New York, the first of American make. It had four wheels and an upright boiler. This year the railroad between Albany and Schenectady was begun, and fourteen miles of the Baltimore & Ohio opened for use. In 1831 Philadelphia was joined to Pittsburgh by a line of communication consisting of a railway to Columbia, a canal thence to Hollidaysburg, another railway thence over the Alleghanies to Johnstown, and then on by canal. The railway over the mountains consisted of inclined planes mounted by the use of stationary engines. It is interesting to notice the view which universally prevailed at

first, that the locomotive could not climb grades, and that where this was necessary stationary engines would have to be used. Not till 1836 was it demonstrated that locomotives could climb. Up to the same date, also, locomotives had burned wood, but this was now found inferior to coal, and began to be given up except where it was much the cheaper fuel.

From 1832 the railway system grew marvelously. The year 1833 saw completed the South Carolina Railroad between Charleston and the Savannah River, one hundred and thirty-six miles. This was the first railway line in this country to carry the mails, and the longest continuous one then in the world. Two years later Boston was connected by railway with Providence, with Lowell, and with Worcester, Baltimore with Washington, and the New York and Erie commenced. In 1839 Worcester was joined to Springfield in the same manner, and in 1841 a passenger could travel by rail from Boston to Rochester, changing cars, however, at least ten times.









